

Draft Recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for the City of Nottingham

*December 1999*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

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

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

© Crown Copyright 1999

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>30</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Nottingham: Detailed Mapping	<i>33</i>
B Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>35</i>
– Nottingham City Council	
– Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum	
– City of Nottingham Conservative Federation	
– City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats	
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>47</i>

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



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for the City of Nottingham on 18 May 1999.

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

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

- **in 11 of the 27 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city and five wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 14 wards and by more than 20 per cent in eight wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 90-91) are that:

- **Nottingham City Council should have 55 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 20 wards, instead of 27 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of seven;**
- **whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years.**

These draft 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 all the proposed wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 9 per cent from the city average.**
- **This level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in every ward expected to vary by no more than 7 per cent from the average for the city in 2004.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for 10 weeks from 14 December 1999. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 22 February 2000:

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

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

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

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Arboretum	2	Park ward (part); Lenton ward (part); Radford ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)	Large map
2	Berridge	3	Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Radford ward (part)	Large map
3	Bestwood	3	Bestwood Park ward; Byron ward (part); Basford ward (part)	Large map
4	Bilborough	3	Bilborough ward; Beechdale ward (part); Strelley ward (part)	Large map
5	Bridge	2	Bridge ward; Park ward (part); Trent ward (part)	Large map
6	Bulwell	3	Bulwell West ward; Bulwell East ward (part)	Large map
7	Bulwell Forest	3	Bulwell East ward (part); Byron ward (part); Portland ward (part)	Large map
8	Clifton North	3	Wilford ward; Clifton West ward (part); Clifton East ward (part)	Large map and Map A1
9	Clifton South	3	Clifton West ward (part); Clifton East ward (part)	Map A1
10	Crane	3	Aspley ward; Strelley ward (part)	Large map
11	Dales	3	Greenwood ward (part); Manvers ward (part); Trent ward (part)	Large map
12	Dunkirk & Lenton	2	Abbey ward (part); Park ward (part)	Large map
13	Leen Valley	3	Beechdale ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part); Radford ward (part); Lenton ward (part)	Large map
14	Mapperley	3	Greenwood ward (part); Mapperley ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)	Large map
15	Radford & Park	2	Park ward (part); Lenton ward (part)	Large map
16	Sherwood	3	Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Mapperley ward (part); Sherwood ward (part)	Large map
17	St Ann's	3	Manvers ward (part); Park ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Trent ward part)	Large map
18	Vernon	3	Basford ward (part); Portland ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part); Radford ward (part)	Large map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
19	Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey	2	Wollaton ward (part); Abbey ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)	Large map
20	Wollaton West	3	Wollaton ward (part); Abbey ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)	Large map

*Notes: 1 The whole city is unparished.*

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



Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Nottingham

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Arboretum	2	7,331	3,666	-3	7,986	3,993	4
2	Berridge	3	12,257	4,086	9	12,240	4,080	6
3	Bestwood	3	11,656	3,885	3	11,587	3,862	0
4	Bilborough	3	10,903	3,634	-3	10,795	3,598	-6
5	Bridge	2	7,453	3,727	-1	8,017	4,009	4
6	Bulwell	3	11,643	3,881	3	11,702	3,901	1
7	Bulwell Forest	3	11,314	3,771	0	11,184	3,728	-3
8	Clifton North	3	10,733	3,578	-5	11,147	3,716	-3
9	Clifton South	3	10,580	3,527	-6	11,167	3,722	-3
10	Crane	3	10,795	3,598	-4	10,722	3,574	-7
11	Dales	3	11,511	3,837	2	12,006	4,002	4
12	Dunkirk & Lenton	2	7,985	3,993	6	7,966	3,983	4
13	Leen Valley	3	11,029	3,676	-2	11,183	3,728	-3
14	Mapperley	3	11,839	3,946	5	12,062	4,021	5
15	Radford & Park	2	7,340	3,670	-3	7,958	3,979	4
16	Sherwood	3	11,612	3,871	3	11,563	3,854	0
17	St Ann's	3	10,818	3,606	-4	11,037	3,679	-4
18	Vernon	3	11,350	3,783	0	11,598	3,866	1
19	Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey	2	6,866	3,433	-9	7,547	3,774	-2
20	Wollaton West	3	12,070	4,023	7	11,970	3,990	4
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>207,085</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>211,437</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,765</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,844</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Nottingham City Council's submission.

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



# 1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Nottingham. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1975 (Report No. 80). Since undertaking that review, the City of Nottingham has become a unitary authority (1 April 1998).

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

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the City Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (second edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

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

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

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

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

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

10 In July 1998, the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. For all unitary councils, it proposed elections by thirds. It also refers to local accountability being maximised where the whole electorate in a council’s area is involved in elections each time they take place, thereby pointing to a pattern of three-member wards for Nottingham to reflect a system of elections by thirds.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Nottinghamshire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

12 Stage One began on 18 May 1999, when we wrote to Nottingham City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Nottinghamshire Local Councils Association, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, the Members of the European Parliament for the East Midlands Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 30 August 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 14 December 1999 and will end on 21 February 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations.**

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



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The City of Nottingham is surrounded by the county of Nottinghamshire, and is situated on the banks of the River Trent, with a large housing estate on the southern bank. The city covers an area of approximately 7,500 hectares and with an electorate of 207,085 is one of the larger unitary authorities in the country.

17 Nottingham City was granted city status by Queen Victoria in 1897, and the City Council became an all-purpose (unitary) authority on 1 April 1998. The city centre lies to the north of the River Trent, and acts as a focus for the residential areas surrounding it. The city is well served by transport links, with the M1 motorway running to the west of the city and the East Midlands railway line linking the city with Leicester and London. The city is home to two universities, Notts County Football Club and Nottingham Race Course.

18 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'.

19 The electorate of the city is 207,085 (February 1999). The Council presently has 55 members who are elected from 27 wards. One ward, Byron, is currently represented by three councillors, while the remainder are represented by two councillors. The whole council is elected every four years.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been a slight decrease in the electorate in Nottingham City, with around 2 per cent fewer electors than two decades ago. At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,765 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 3,844 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 11 of the 27 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the city average, of which five wards vary by more than 20 per cent and two wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Wollaton ward where the councillor represents 42 per cent more electors than the city average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Nottingham*



Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Abbey	2	10,272	5,136	36	10,190	5,095	33
2	Aspley	2	7,222	3,611	-4	7,176	3,588	-7
3	Basford	2	7,512	3,756	0	7,465	3,733	-3
4	Beechdale	2	7,184	3,592	-5	7,168	3,584	-7
5	Bestwood Park	2	6,520	3,260	-13	6,497	3,249	-15
6	Bilborough	2	5,340	2,670	-29	5,296	2,648	-31
7	Bridge	2	6,790	3,395	-10	6,722	3,361	-13
8	Bulwell East	2	7,513	3,757	0	7,565	3,783	-2
9	Bulwell West	2	8,662	4,331	15	8,623	4,312	12
10	Byron	3	9,987	3,329	-12	9,889	3,296	-14
11	Clifton East	2	5,871	2,936	-22	5,812	2,906	-24
12	Clifton West	2	8,185	4,093	9	9,312	4,656	21
13	Forest	2	7,934	3,967	5	7,959	3,980	4
14	Greenwood	2	7,937	3,969	5	8,250	4,125	7
15	Lenton	2	7,551	3,776	0	8,255	4,128	7
16	Manvers	2	7,393	3,697	-2	7,375	3,688	-4
17	Mapperley	2	8,157	4,079	8	8,171	4,086	6
18	Park	2	8,297	4,149	10	9,662	4,831	26
19	Portland	2	7,685	3,843	2	7,927	3,964	3
20	Radford	2	6,616	3,308	-12	6,808	3,404	-11
21	Robin Hood	2	9,154	4,577	22	9,824	4,912	28
22	Sherwood	2	6,506	3,253	-14	6,568	3,284	-15
23	St Ann's	2	8,029	4,015	7	7,991	3,996	4
24	Strelley	2	6,054	3,027	-20	5,997	2,999	-22

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
25 Trent	2	6,794	3,397	-10	7,171	3,586	-7
26 Wilford	2	7,257	3,629	-4	7,190	3,595	-6
27 Wollaton	2	10,663	5,332	42	10,574	5,287	38
<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>207,085</b>	-	-	<b>211,437</b>	-	-
<b>Averages</b>	-	-	<b>3,765</b>	-	-	<b>3,844</b>	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, electors in Bilborough ward are currently relatively over-represented by 29 per cent, while electors in Wollaton ward are relatively under-represented by 42 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

21 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Nottingham City Council.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers from the City Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received six representations during Stage One, including four city-wide schemes from the City Council, Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum, City of Nottingham Conservative Federation and City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission.

#### **Nottingham City Council**

23 The City Council proposed a council of 54 members, one fewer than at present, serving 18 wards, nine fewer than at present. It proposed a three-member ward pattern throughout the city, reinstating the same number of wards and councillors that existed prior to the 1976 electoral review. It stated however that it had consulted on two schemes, one for 18 three-member wards and one for 27 two-member wards. As a result of that consultation, the Council adopted the 18-ward scheme subject to a number of ward boundary amendments. The proposed scheme would modify all of the existing wards.

24 The Council proposed the creation of two new wards to the south of the river – Clifton North and Clifton South – reducing the number of wards from three to two. It proposed a new Castle ward incorporating the majority of the existing Bridge and Park wards, a new Dales ward based on the existing Trent and Greenwood wards and a new Priory ward based on the existing Abbey ward and incorporating parts of Lenton and Wollaton wards, each crossing the main railway line. It proposed revised boundaries for the wards of Wollaton, Bilborough, Aspley (to be renamed Crane), Mapperley, Manvers (to be renamed St Ann’s), Bulwell West (to be renamed Bulwell), Bulwell East (to be renamed Bulwell Forest), Bestwood Park (to be renamed Bestwood) and Sherwood. In the central city area, it created four new wards – Arboretum, Berridge, Leen Valley and Vernon – based on the existing wards of Lenton, St Ann’s, Radford, Robin Hood, Forest, Basford and Portland.

25 The City Council supported the retention of whole-council elections every four years. It also stated that it wished to “formally draw the Commission’s attention to anomalies concerning the City’s external boundaries and the need to rationalise and update these at a future date”. The Council’s proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

## **Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum**

26 Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum (“The Forum”), proposed a pattern of 21 wards, 13 of which would be represented by three councillors with the remaining eight being represented by two councillors making a total of 55 councillors. It considered that “its proposed mix of three- and two-member wards is the best and most efficient way of achieving... electoral equality whilst reflecting the identities and interests of local communities, and securing effective and convenient local government.” It argued that it had “sought to achieve electoral equality whilst being mindful of local community identities.” It stated that it had consulted with local community associations and tenants’ organisations in order to establish local community boundaries.

27 The Forum proposed two new wards to the south of the river and used the main railway line as the boundary for its proposed Meadows & Riverside ward which would combine the majority of the existing Bridge and Trent wards to the north of the river. It proposed creating a new two-member Dunkirk & Lenton ward incorporating the communities of Dunkirk, Old Lenton and New Lenton, and a new Lenton Abbey & Wollaton West ward combining parts of the existing Wollaton, Lenton and Abbey wards. It proposed modified boundaries for Wollaton, Sherwood, Mapperley, Basford, Park, Aspley (to be renamed Aspley & Whitemoor), Strelley (to be renamed Broxtowe & Strelley), Bulwell West, Bulwell East and Manvers (to be renamed St Ann’s) wards. It proposed that the majority of Bilborough and Beechdale wards be combined to form a new Beechdale & Bilborough ward, and that Bestwood Park ward be expanded westwards to incorporate the majority of Byron ward to form a new Bestwood & Top Valley ward. Forest ward would be expanded southwards and renamed Forest Fields ward, while new wards of Radford South and Radford North would be formed comprising parts of the existing Robin Hood, Lenton and Radford wards.

## **The City of Nottingham Conservative Federation**

28 The City of Nottingham Conservative Federation (“the Conservatives”) proposed a council of 54 councillors, one fewer than at present, representing 27 wards. They proposed a pattern of two-member wards throughout the city, amending the boundaries of all the current wards. While they proposed a council size of 54, they stated that “there is an arguable case for 60, or even 72 [councillors].” However, did not submit a scheme to this effect. They argued that their proposed smaller two-member wards would provide “better community identity, fairer representation, clearer identification of councillors by their electors and more manageable representational workloads for councillors”.

29 The Conservatives’ scheme provided modifications to the boundaries of the three wards to the south of the River Trent, and combined Bridge and Trent wards to form a new Riverside ward, to the north of the river. They proposed seven new wards – Raleigh, Cinderhill, University, Highbury, Hyson Green, Arboretum and Sneinton – while largely retaining the existing Abbey, Bestwood Park (to be renamed Bestwood), Byron, Forest, Greenwood, Park, Strelley and Wollaton wards.

## **The City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats**

30 The City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats (“the Liberal Democrats”) submitted a city-wide scheme based on a council size of 55 divided between 22 wards represented by a mixture of two or three councillors. They argued that their proposed warding structure “provides the flexibility to absorb changes”. They argued that they had utilised their local knowledge in formulating their proposals in order to recognise local communities within the city.

31 The Liberal Democrats’ scheme would modify all of the existing wards. It proposed two wards for the Clifton area to the south of the river, but proposed combining the Wilford area with Bridge and Trent wards to the north of the River Trent, arguing that “the river is not as strong a factor of division as it might first appear, at least not along this stretch”. They proposed expanding the existing Abbey, Robin Hood, Sherwood and Basford wards, and dividing the Bulwell area north/south (to form the new wards of Bulwell North and a Bulwell South) rather than east/west as now. They proposed that Beechdale ward be divided between Bilborough, Strelley, Aspley and Robin Hood wards, that Portland ward be divided between Bulwell South, Aspley and Basford wards. Under their proposals, Radford ward would be divided between Forest, Basford and Robin Hood wards.

32 The Liberal Democrats also proposed that community councillors be introduced with wards “coincident with the Unitary Council wards”, based on neighbourhood areas. However, there is no provision within the legislation for us to propose community councillors that reflect these neighbourhood areas, and as part of this review we are only able to consider the city’s warding arrangements.

## **Other Representations**

33 We received two further representations from Councillor Edwards and a local resident. Councillor Edwards, who represents Mapperley ward, proposed uniting all the properties on Morley Road, Private Road, Gordon Rise and Maurice Drive in Mapperley ward. The local resident argued that “the controversial planned electoral changes will make Nottingham City Council more undemocratic and inefficient than it has already become” and questioned the real reasons behind the proposed electoral ward changes.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

### **Electorate Forecasts**

38 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 2 per cent from 207,085 to 211,437 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be around the city centre, mainly due to the building of student accommodation. The Council has estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

39 The Forum argued that, based on the number of developments on the Planning List, the City Council had underestimated electorate growth in the city centre area. We contacted the City Council in this regard and they confirmed that, in their professional judgement, they did not expect all of the proposed developments to take place during this period. We accept that

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

## **Council Size**

40 Nottingham City Council presently has 55 members. The City Council and Conservatives both proposed a small reduction in council size to 54, while the Liberal Democrats and the Forum both proposed retaining the existing council size of 55. The Conservatives stated that they considered that "there is an arguable case for 60, or even 72 [councillors]" but, though invited to do so, did not submit a scheme for either council size.

41 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government. The Commission will not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but will be prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. In this case, we have had four city-wide schemes based broadly upon the existing council size, and we have not received any persuasive evidence to support a significant increase in council size.

42 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 55 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

43 We have carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including city-wide schemes from Nottingham City Council, Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum, City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats and City of Nottingham Conservative Party. From these representations, some considerations have emerged which have assisted us in preparing our draft recommendations.

44 There was little consensus between the schemes with regard to either ward boundaries or the number of councillors per ward and there was limited evidence in support of some of the proposals. The schemes put forward similar council sizes with the City Council and the Conservatives proposing 54 councillors, a decrease in one councillor, and the Liberal Democrats and the Forum proposing 55 councillors, the same as at present. All four city-wide proposals would also lead to a significant improvement in the level of electoral equality. A variety of ward patterns was proposed, with the City Council proposing a pattern of three-member wards, the Conservatives proposing a pattern of two-member wards, and the Liberal Democrats and the Forum putting forward mixed warding arrangements of both two- and three-member wards.

45 Having carefully considered all the submissions received, we have concluded that a uniform ward pattern may not be the best approach in reflecting the community ties within the city. Upon visiting the area, we considered that the best balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria would be achieved through a predominantly three-ward structure, but that in the city



centre and the south-west of the city, community ties would be best reflected by a warding structure consisting of two-member wards.

46 In preparing our draft recommendations we have, wherever possible, used natural, easily identifiable boundaries, and we have endeavoured to use such boundaries as the River Trent, major roads and railway lines where we consider that they form significant boundaries between communities. We have attempted to unite the main shopping areas in Sneinton, Sherwood and the city centre within single wards in order to retain their integrity as commercial entities and also, where possible, have retained whole housing estates and similar housing developments such as St Ann’s, Broxtowe, Bestwood, the Meadows, the Park and Mapperley within single wards.

47 For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Clifton East, Clifton West and Wilford wards;
- (b) Bridge, Greenwood, Lenton, Park and Trent wards;
- (c) Abbey, Aspley, Beechdale, Bilborough, Strelley and Wollaton wards;
- (d) Bestwood Park, Bulwell East, Bulwell West and Byron wards;
- (e) Basford, Forest, Portland, Radford and Robin Hood wards;
- (f) Manvers, Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann’s wards.

48 Details of our draft 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.

**Clifton East, Clifton West and Wilford wards**

49 The three wards of Clifton East, Clifton West and Wilford are each represented by two councillors and are located to the south of the River Trent. Clifton East and Wilford wards currently have 22 per cent and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor respectively (and 24 per cent and 6 per cent fewer than average by 2004). Clifton West ward currently has 9 per cent more electors per councillor than average, increasing to 21 per cent more than average by 2004.

50 The City Council proposed creating two wards to the south of the river, Clifton North and Clifton South, each represented by three councillors. It proposed that the boundary between the two wards would run to the south of the Polytechnic, and then along Clapton Lane and Green Lane. The Council recognised that, under its proposals, the area would be relatively over-represented. However, it argued that this was preferable to combining an area to the south of the river with one to its north with which it has no community link. It considered that “the River Trent forms one of the strongest natural boundaries within the City of Nottingham”. Their proposed Clifton North and Clifton South wards would have 2 per cent and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently respectively, based on a council size of 54.

51 The Forum also put forward two three-member wards for the area to the south of the river, although it proposed a slightly different boundary to that proposed by the City Council between its proposed Clifton North & Wilford and Clifton South wards. Its boundary would run to the south of the Polytechnic, along the centre of Clapton Lane and Stanesbury Rise and to the rear

of the properties on the south side of Lanthwaite Road, Bainton Grove and Glencoe Road. It argued that “the campus and Clapton Lane are clear boundaries and Lanthwaite Road is also a dividing line”. Its proposed Clifton North & Wilford and Clifton South wards, based on a council size of 55, would have 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (both having 3 per cent fewer than average in 2004).

52 The Conservatives proposed three two-member wards for the area. Their proposed Wilford ward would be based on the existing ward, with the exception of the Bridgnorth Drive area which would be transferred to a revised Clifton East ward, and the Foxearth Avenue area which would be transferred from the existing Clifton East ward. The remainder of the existing Clifton East ward would be combined with all roads leading from Clapton Lane and the Havenwood Rise area to form a revised Clifton East ward. The revised Clifton West ward would be based on the existing ward less those areas transferred to Clifton East ward. Their proposed Clifton East, Clifton West and Wilford wards would, based on a council size of 54, have 4 per cent, 20 per cent and 5 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (4 per cent, 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer by 2004).

53 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the area to the south of the River Trent should be divided between three wards, and that Wilford area to the north of the A52 should be combined with the Meadows estate area to the north of the River Trent in a revised Bridge ward. They argued that “the river is not as strong a factor of division as it might at first appear”. Their proposed Clifton East ward would incorporate the remainder of Wilford ward (to the south of the A52), the existing Clifton East ward and the Whitegate Vale area of Clifton West ward. The remainder of the area to the south of the river would form a revised Clifton West ward. The proposed Clifton East and Clifton West wards would, based on a council size of 55, have 8 per cent more and 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (4 per cent and 9 per cent more than average by 2004).

54 Having carefully considered the submissions received during Stage One, we consider that the River Trent does provide a significant barrier between communities and that it should not be breached. We note that the Conservatives proposed three wards for this area each represented by two councillors, while the Council and The Forum proposed two wards each represented by three councillors. We consider that there is some merit in both approaches, but consider that on balance the Forum’s proposals would best reflect community ties while achieving a reasonable level for electoral equality. However, we propose that the new wards should be named Clifton North and Clifton South, as proposed by the City Council. We would, however, welcome further views on the most appropriate warding arrangements for this area at Stage Three. Our proposed Clifton North and Clifton South wards would have 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors than the city average currently (both improving to 3 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated in Map A1 at Appendix A.

### **Bridge, Greenwood, Lenton, Park and Trent wards**

55 These five wards cover the city centre and the south-east of the city including the Meadows estate and part of the Sneinton area. Bridge and Trent wards currently each have 10 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, and are forecast by 2004 to have 13 per cent

and 7 per cent fewer than average. Lenton ward currently has equal to the average number of electors per councillor, but by 2004 is forecast to have 7 per cent more than average. Greenwood and Park wards have 5 per cent and 10 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively, and this level of electoral equality is expected to deteriorate to 7 per cent and 26 per cent more than average by 2004.

56 The City Council proposed three wards each represented by three councillors covering much of this area. Its proposed Castle ward would incorporate the majority of the current Bridge ward, that part of Trent ward to the south of Poplar Street and west of Manvers Street, Meadow Lane and Lady Bay Bridge, and that part of Park ward to the south of Derby Road and Upper Parliament Street and east of Park Street and Willoughby Street. The part of Park ward to the west of Park Street and Willoughby Street would be combined with part of Abbey ward in a proposed Priory ward as discussed in more detail below. It proposed a new Dales ward comprising the remainder of Trent ward, together with that part of Greenwood ward to the south of Carlton Road and that part of Manvers ward to the south of Sneinton Primary School. It argued that this would unite the majority of the Sneinton community within one ward. Its proposed Arboretum ward would comprise Lenton ward, less the area to the west of Lenton Boulevard, the part of Park ward to the north of Derby Road and Upper Parliament Street and west of Sherwood Street, that part of St Ann's ward to the west of Mansfield Road and the southernmost area of Radford ward. It stated that this new ward would form a compact inner city ward, including the whole of Nottingham Trent University. The proposed Castle and Arboretum wards would have 5 per cent and 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, while Dales ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor, based on a council size of 54 (1 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent more than average in 2004).

57 The Forum proposed a mixed pattern of wards for this area. It proposed that The Meadows & Riverside ward be represented by two councillors, and would cover the parts of Trent and Bridge wards to the south of the East Midlands railway line and east of Lenton Lane. It proposed a new three-member Sneinton & Bakersfield ward comprising the part of Greenwood ward to the south of Carlton Road, that part of Manvers ward to the south of Windmill Lane and the playing fields, and that part of Trent ward to the east of Manvers Street and north of the railway line. It argued that this would contain the communities of Sneinton and Bakersfield and cover a distinct and self contained area. It proposed that The Park & City Centre ward should be represented by two councillors. The proposed ward would incorporate that part of Park ward to the east of Harlaxton Road, that part of Bridge ward to the north of the railway line and the part of St Ann's ward to the south of Forest Recreation Ground and west of Huntingdon Street. It proposed that the current Lenton ward be divided between the proposed Radford South and Radford North wards. Its two-member Radford South ward would combine the majority of Lenton ward together with a small part of Robin Hood ward, while the three-member Radford North ward would combine Radford ward with the parts of Lenton ward to the north of Hartley Road and east of Alfreton Road and the Grassington Road area from Robin Hood ward. Based on a council size of 55, the proposed wards of Radford North, The Meadows & Riverside and The Park & City Centre would have 1 per cent, 3 per cent and 27 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, improving to 1 per cent more, 1 per cent fewer and 9 per cent fewer by 2004. It argued that the planning list shows a higher level of growth in the city centre, and that it is likely that its proposed The Park & City Centre ward would have a better level of electoral equality.

Radford South and Sneinton & Bakersfield would have 2 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor currently, with both having 5 per cent more than average by 2004.

58 The Conservatives proposed four two-member wards for this area. They proposed that Park ward reflect the current ward less the area to the north of Derby Road and Upper Parliament Street which form part of a new Arboretum ward. The existing Bridge ward would be combined with the part of Trent ward to the south of the railway line to form a new Riverside ward. Lenton ward, less the area to the east of Alfreton Road and west of Lenton Boulevard, would be combined with the part of Robin Hood ward to the east of the railway line to form a new Radford ward. They proposed that the existing Greenwood ward be expanded to include the part of Trent ward to the east of Trent Road and Trent Lane and south of Sneinton Dale. The proposed Riverside, Park, Radford and Greenwood wards would have 4 per cent, 13 per cent, 4 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively based on a council size of 54. By 2004, none of the wards would have variance in excess of 2 per cent from the average.

59 The Liberal Democrats proposed a three-member Bridge ward, combining the current ward, the majority of the current Trent ward and the Wilford area of Wilford ward as detailed above. They proposed a revised Park ward consisting broadly the part of the current ward to the south of Derby Road and Upper Parliament Street, and a revised Lenton ward, largely based on the current ward. Both wards would be represented by two councillors. They proposed largely retaining the existing Greenwood ward, represented by two councillors, with the exception of a small area which would form part of a revised Mapperley ward. Based on a 55-member council, their proposed Bridge, Greenwood, Lenton and Park wards would have 6 per cent, 4 per cent, 9 per cent and 15 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively (5 per cent fewer, 6 per cent fewer, 2 per cent fewer and equal to the average in 2004).

60 We have considered the representations received at Stage One in relation to this area. We note that while the Council proposed combining The Meadows area with the City Centre and The Park, the other city-wide schemes proposed combining it with the part of Trent ward to the south of the railway line. We consider that the area to the east of Lady Bay Bridge has a greater affinity with the Sneinton area to its north than The Meadows area to its west, and we are content to endorse the City Council's Dales ward. We have not been persuaded to combine The Meadows area, to the south of the city centre, with The Park area, to its west, as we consider that these areas share little affinity. While we recognise that Derby Road is a significant boundary, we consider that The Park area would be better combined with the Radford area to its north. We therefore propose an amended Bridge ward, which would reflect the City Council's proposed Castle ward less The Park area and would be represented by two councillors. Our proposed Radford & Park ward would be represented by two councillors and would combine The Park estate, to the east of Harlaxton Drive and west of Maid Marion Way, with that part of Lenton ward to the west of Alfreton Road and east of Lenton Boulevard. Our proposed Arboretum ward would incorporate that part of the existing Park and St Ann's wards to the west of Sherwood Street, south of Gregory Boulevard and north of Alfreton Road and Upper Parliament Street and that part of the existing Radford ward to the east of Chadwick Road. We consider that these proposals would reflect community ties in this area well, and would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality. Our proposed two-member Arboretum, Bridge and Radford & Park wards would have

3 per cent, 1 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (with all three wards having 4 per cent more than average in 2004). Our proposed three-member Dales ward would have 2 per cent more electors per councillor currently (and 4 per cent more in 2004).

### **Abbey, Aspley, Beechdale, Bilborough, Strelley and Wollaton wards**

61 These six wards cover the west of the city. Abbey and Wollaton wards currently have 36 per cent and 42 per cent more electors per councillor respectively, while Aspley, Beechdale, Bilborough and Strelley wards have 4 per cent, 5 per cent, 29 per cent and 20 per cent fewer electors per councillor than average respectively.

62 The City Council put forward a pattern of four wards covering most of this area. It proposed a new Priory ward comprising Abbey ward, less the area to the north of Sutton Passeys Crescent, a small part of Bridge ward, the Lenton Abbey area of Wollaton ward and the part of Robin Hood ward to the south of Wollaton Road. It argued that the ward would unite the whole of the Nottingham University campus, which is currently divided between Wollaton and Abbey wards, and would have 7 per cent more electors than the city average (and 4 per cent in 2004). The City Council argued that the existing Wollaton ward excluded large areas of the Wollaton community, and proposed that the revised Wollaton ward incorporate the existing Wollaton ward, less the Lenton Abbey area, the northernmost part of Abbey ward and the Southwold Drive area of Robin Hood ward. This revised Wollaton ward would have 9 per cent more electors than the city average currently (6 per cent in 2004). Bilborough ward would be extended eastwards to incorporate that part of Beechdale ward to the west of Beechdale Road and Robins Wood Road, and northwards to incorporate the part of Strelley ward to the west of Helston Drive. Its proposed Bilborough ward would have 9 per cent more electors than the city average currently (6 per cent in 2004). It proposed a new Crane ward comprising the remainder of Strelley ward, Aspley ward and that part of Robin Hood ward to the east of Melbourne Road. It argued that this ward would combine the Broxtowe Estate and the Bells Lane Estate within a single ward. The proposed ward would have 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average currently, based on a council size of 54 (improving to 2 per cent in 2004).

63 The Forum proposed a new two-member Dunkirk & Lenton ward comprising the part of Abbey ward to the south of the University Park Boating Lake and the part of the current Park ward to the west of Harlaxton Drive. It argued that this ward would unite the three communities of Dunkirk, Old Lenton and New Lenton, the area covered by the historic parish of Lenton and the Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum, and that local people were seeking to create an urban parish council for the area. The proposed Dunkirk & Lenton ward would have 6 per cent more electors than the city average currently (4 per cent in 2004). It proposed a new two-member Lenton Abbey & Wollaton East ward comprising the University of Nottingham and Sutton Passeys Crescent areas of Abbey ward, the Lenton Abbey area of Wollaton ward and the part of Robin Hood ward to the south of Wollaton Road. The proposed ward would have 9 per cent fewer electors than the city average currently (2 per cent in 2004). Its proposed Wollaton West ward would comprise the remainder of Wollaton and Abbey wards together with that part of Bilborough ward to the south of Trowell Road. It stated that the proposed ward covers “a distinct area which local people clearly identify as Wollaton”, and would contain 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average currently (2 per cent more in 2004). It proposed combining

the majority of the existing Bilborough ward with Beechdale ward to form a new three-member Beechdale & Bilborough ward which would have 3 per cent more electors than the city average (equal to the city average in 2004). It stated that this is a “clearly defined area covering two established communities”. The Forum proposed a new Broxtowe & Strelley ward combining the existing Strelley ward with the northern part of Aspley ward, arguing that this ward would contain similar types of housing. This new ward would be represented by two councillors and would have 4 per cent more electors than the city average (1 per cent in 2004). It combined the remainder of Aspley ward with the southern part of Portland ward and northern part of Robin Hood ward in a three-member Aspley & Whitemoor ward. It argued that the proposed ward would have “strong physical boundaries of open space, main roads and a railway line”. This ward would have 2 per cent more electors than the city average (1 per cent in 2004) based on a 55-member council.

64 The Conservatives proposed seven two-member wards to cover these six existing wards. They proposed a new University ward, incorporating the parts of Abbey and Wollaton wards to the south of Derby Road, less the Old Lenton area. Their proposed Raleigh ward would comprise the remainder of Abbey ward and southern parts of Robin Hood and Lenton wards. They proposed retaining the existing Wollaton ward less the Lenton Abbey area. They proposed expanding Bilborough ward to incorporate the western part of the existing Beechdale ward. The remainder of the existing Beechdale ward would be combined with the part of Robin Hood ward to the west of the railway line, north of Wollaton Road and south of Wilkinson Street. They proposed that Strelley ward be expanded to encompass the northern part of Aspley ward, and a revised Aspley ward incorporating the part of the current ward to the south of Broxtowe Lane and the northern part of Robin Hood ward. Their proposals resulted in no ward having an electoral variance of more than 9 per cent currently (4 per cent in 2004), based on a council size of 54 members.

65 The Liberal Democrats proposed a revised Abbey ward, represented by three councillors, which would incorporate the current ward less the area to the north of Wollaton Road together with the Lenton Abbey area of Wollaton ward and westernmost part of Park ward. They proposed a three-member Wollaton ward incorporating the current ward, the northern part of Abbey ward and southern part of Bilborough ward. They proposed expanding the existing Bilborough ward to include part of Beechdale ward, and modifying the boundaries of Strelley ward to incorporate parts of Aspley and Beechdale wards. Both wards would continue to be represented by two councillors. They proposed a two-member that Aspley & Stockhill ward incorporating the majority of the current Aspley ward and parts of Beechdale and Portland wards. Under their proposals, no ward would have an electoral variance of more than 6 per cent from the average currently (3 per cent in 2004), based on a council size of 55.

66 Having considered the representations received we have concluded that the proposals put forward by The Forum would best reflect community identity in its proposed Dunkirk & Lenton, Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey and Wollaton West wards. We have been persuaded that there are significant community ties between Dunkirk, Old Lenton and New Lenton and that they should be united to create a two-member ward. In particular, we consider that Harlaxton Drive would provide a good boundary as it would unite the whole of the New Lenton area in one ward, and provides a clear division with The Park area to its east. However, we propose that the western

boundary be amended slightly to run along University Boulevard rather than the northern shore of the boating lake as this is a more easily identifiable boundary. We are also proposing minor modifications to The Forum's proposed three-member Wollaton West and two-member Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey wards in order to provide improved boundaries and better reflect community ties. We propose that the whole of Wollaton Park and all roads leading from Radford Bridge Road be contained within Wollaton West ward. We also propose to retain the boundary of the railway line as proposed by the Council and the Conservatives.

67 We are basing our draft recommendations on the proposals put forward by the City Council for its proposed Bilborough and Crane wards, which we consider would unite similar areas and provide good boundaries. However, we propose a number of minor boundary modifications in order to improve electoral equality. We propose that the eastern boundary of Bilborough ward run along the centre of Beechdale Road for its entire length, including the Aspley Park Drive area in a new Leen Valley ward as discussed below. We also propose that those properties accessed from Helston Drive should form part of our proposed Bilborough ward. In order to provide better electoral equality, we propose that the existing ward boundary to the rear of the properties on Melbourne Road should be retained as the new eastern boundary for our proposed Crane ward.

68 Our draft recommendations would result in Bilborough, Crane and Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey wards having 3 per cent, 4 per cent and 9 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (6 per cent, 7 per cent and 2 per cent in 2004), and Dunkirk & Lenton and Wollaton West wards having 6 per cent and 7 per cent more electors than the city average (both 4 per cent in 2004).

### **Bestwood Park, Bulwell East, Bulwell West and Byron wards**

69 These four wards are situated in the north of the city. Bestwood Park, Bullwell East and Bullwell West wards are each represented by two councillors, while Byron ward is represented by three councillors. Bestwood Park and Byron wards cover the Bestwood and Top Valley area and currently have 13 per cent and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average. Bulwell East ward has equal the average number of electors per councillor while Bulwell West ward has 15 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average.

70 At Stage One, the Council proposed reconfiguring the existing four wards to create three wards each represented by three councillors. It proposed a new Bulwell Forest ward comprising the whole of Bulwell West ward and the part of Bulwell East ward to the west of railway line and Bestwood Road, which it argued would unite "the two parts of Bulwell using the natural boundary of the railway line". It proposed that the remainder of Bulwell East ward be combined with that part of Portland ward to the north of Kersall Drive, and that part of Byron ward to the west of Old Farm Road and Muirfield Road. It proposed that the remainder of Byron ward be combined with Bestwood Park ward and that part of Basford ward to the north of the hospital to form a new Bestwood ward. It argued that this ward would "include the whole of the Bestwood Park and Bestwood Estate". The proposed Bulwell and Bestwood wards would both have 1 per cent more electors per councillor than average (equal to the average and 1 per cent fewer by 2004). Bulwell Forest ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than average (and 5 per cent in 2004) based on a council size of 54.

71 At Stage One, The Forum proposed three wards covering the northern part of the city. It proposed a three-member Bulwell West ward, encompassing the existing ward, the western part of Bulwell East ward and the northernmost part of Portland ward. It argued that this ward would unite Bulwell's main shopping street within a single ward. Its proposed two-member Bulwell East ward would incorporate the existing ward less the area transferred to the new Bulwell West ward, and the Highbury Vale area from Portland ward. Its proposed three-member Bestwood & Top Valley ward would comprise the northern parts of the existing Byron and Bestwood Park wards. The southern parts of these wards, broadly to the south of Southglade Park and Southglade and Glade Hill schools would form part of a new Basford ward, as discussed below. The proposed Bestwood & Top Valley, Bulwell East and Bulwell West wards would have 2 per cent more, 5 per cent more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor respectively (1 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and 2 per cent fewer in 2004).

72 The Conservatives proposed five two-member wards for this part of the city. They proposed a new Bulwell ward comprising the northern part of the existing Bulwell West ward and the part of Bulwell East ward to the west of the railway line. They proposed that the southern part of Bulwell West ward, broadly to the south of the railway station, should be combined with the part of Portland ward to the west of the railway line and a small section of Robin Wood ward to form a new Cinderhill ward. Their proposed Highbury ward would comprise the remaining part of Bulwell East ward together with the majority of the eastern half of Portland ward. They proposed amending the boundaries of the existing Byron ward to reduce the electorate, and expanding the existing Bestwood Park ward to incorporate the part of Byron ward to the east of Old Farm Road, and renamed it Bestwood ward. Under a 54-member council, these proposals would result in no ward having an electoral variance of more than 5 per cent currently or in 2004.

73 The Liberal Democrats proposed four wards for this area. While the other three city-wide schemes proposed dividing the Bulwell area broadly along the railway line, the Liberal Democrats wards for the northern and southern areas. The proposed two-member Bulwell North ward would incorporate the northern parts of the existing Bulwell East and Bulwell West wards, while the new three-member Bulwell South ward would incorporate the southernmost parts of the existing Bulwell East and Bulwell West wards and northernmost parts of Portland and Basford wards. They proposed extending Byron ward southwards to incorporate the part of Basford ward to the north of the hospital, and extending Bestwood Park southwards to incorporate the Longmead Drive area of Basford ward. Their proposed Bestwood Park, Bulwell North and Bulwell South wards would all have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (equal to the average, 1 per cent and 1 per cent more by 2004). Their proposed Byron ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average (5 per cent fewer by 2004).

74 We carefully considered all the representations received during Stage One and are content to endorse the City Council's proposals for this area. We consider that the proposals would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality and would reflect community ties in the area. In particular, the proposed wards would unite the Main Street shopping area within Bulwell ward and the Bestwood Park and Bestwood Estate areas in a new Bestwood ward. In addition, the proposed wards would utilise the railway line as a boundary between Bulwell and Bulwell Forest wards, and would unite the roads either side of Arnold Road. Our proposed Bestwood and



Bulwell wards would have 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (equal to and 1 per cent more in 2004), while Bulwell Forest ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor currently (and 3 per cent fewer by 2004). We would welcome the views of interested parties on these proposals at Stage Three.

### **Basford, Forest, Portland, Radford and Robin Hood wards**

75 Basford, Forest, Portland, Radford and Robin Hood wards are located to the north of the city centre. Basford ward has equal the average number of electors per councillor; Forest, Portland and Robin Hood wards have 5 per cent, 2 per cent and 22 per cent more electors per councillor respectively, while Radford ward has 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average.

76 The Council proposed a new Vernon ward combining that part of the existing Basford ward to the west of Hucknall Road and north of Valley Road, the current Portland ward less the Highbury Vale area and the Whitemoor area of Radford and Robin Hood wards to the west of Radford Road and north of Wilkinson Street. It argued that this ward would “encompass all of the Old Basford area of the city”, and would use the ring road and arterial roads to form easily identifiable boundaries. It proposed that the Longmead Drive area of Basford ward should form part of a revised Sherwood ward. It proposed that the current Forest ward, less the area to the east of Hucknall Road (which would form part of a revised Sherwood ward), be combined with that part of Radford ward to the south of Valley Road and east of Radford Road to form a new Berridge ward. It argued that the proposed Berridge ward would be neat and compact, using the ring road and major arterial routes as its boundaries. The Hyson Green area of Radford ward would be combined with the majority of Robin Hood ward and parts of Beechdale and Lenton wards to form a new Leen Valley ward. Its proposed Vernon and Leen Valley wards would have 1 per cent and 9 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average, based on a council size of 54 (and 1 per cent and 2 per cent by 2004), while Berridge ward would have 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average (4 per cent by 2004).

77 The Forum proposed a modified Basford ward, as described earlier, comprising the majority of the existing Basford ward, the southern areas of Byron and Bestwood Park wards, and westernmost part of Portland ward, covering “two distinct areas”. As described earlier it proposed that Robin Hood ward be divided between the proposed Aspley & Whitemoor, Radford North, Radford South and Lenton Abbey & Wollaton West wards. It proposed that Radford ward should be expanded to form a new Radford North ward, as described earlier. It modified the existing Forest ward to form a two-member Forest Fields ward, including Forest Recreation Ground, but transferring the eastern area of the existing ward to a modified Sherwood ward, described later. The Forum argued that “Nottingham’s first community-based credit union was formed in Forest Fields.” This would result in the proposed Basford and Forest Fields wards having 1 per cent and equal to the average number of electors per councillor based on a 55-member council (1 per cent and 2 per cent fewer in 2004).

78 At Stage One the Conservatives proposed that Robin Hood ward be divided between surrounding wards, as described earlier. They proposed that Portland ward be modified to incorporate the southern part of Bulwell West ward and most northern part of Robin Hood ward,

and be renamed Cinderhill ward. It proposed modifying the boundaries of the existing Basford ward to include the southernmost area of the existing Byron ward, and easternmost part of the existing Portland ward. It proposed retaining Radford ward largely on its existing boundaries, less the southern area, incorporating the western part of the existing Forest ward, and renaming it Hyson Green ward. They proposed that the remainder of Forest ward be combined with the southernmost part of Sherwood ward. This would result in no ward having an electoral variance of more than 4 per cent from the average currently (and 3 per cent in 2004), based on a 54-member council.

79 The Liberal Democrats proposed two two-member and two-three member wards for this western area of the city. They proposed that Sherwood ward be extended to incorporate the hospital, both sides of the Mansfield Road shopping area, and the Sherwood Rise area, currently in Forest ward, stating that this would “represent community identity”, and that it be represented by three councillors. They proposed modifying the boundaries of the existing Mapperley ward so that the northern area would be transferred to Sherwood ward and Mapperley ward would incorporate the northern part of Greenwood ward, but would retain two councillors. They proposed an amended St Ann’s ward, less the northern area (to be transferred to Forest ward, as described earlier) and incorporating the northern area of Manvers ward, represented by an additional councillor. Manvers ward, under the Liberal Democrats’ scheme, would remain represented by two councillors, but would have the northern area transferred to St Ann’s ward, and would incorporate the northern part of Trent ward. They argued that this would “rebuild... the area known as Sneinton”. The resulting Manvers, Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann’s wards would have electoral variances of 6 per cent, 4 per cent, 6 per cent and 5 per cent currently (3 per cent, 3 per cent, 4 per cent and 2 per cent in 2004).

80 As described earlier we are proposing a new Arboretum ward which would incorporate part of the existing Radford ward. Elsewhere in this area, however, we are proposing to base our draft recommendations on the submission put forward by the City Council. We consider that the Council’s proposals would provide compact wards which achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality, utilise good boundaries and reflect community ties well. We do, however, propose a number of minor boundary changes to its proposed Leen Valley ward. We propose that the western boundary between the proposed Bilborough and Leen Valley wards should run along Beechdale Road for its entire length, incorporating the Aspley Park Drive area in Leen Valley ward. We consider that the Southwold Drive area shares affinity with the areas to its east, and propose to also include this area in Leen Valley ward. We also propose to retain the existing boundary to the east of Melbourne Road, and to transfer the Hyson Green area to the east of Chadwick Road to the new Arboretum ward. This amended Leen Valley ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently, and 3 per cent fewer in 2004. The proposed Berridge and Vernon wards would have 9 per cent more and equal to the city average electors per councillor respectively, and 6 per cent and 1 per cent more than average by 2004.

### **Manvers, Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann’s wards**

81 These four wards are located in the east of the city. Mapperley and St Ann’s wards currently have 8 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor respectively, while Manvers and Sherwood wards have 2 per cent and 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor respectively.

82 At Stage One the Council proposed that these four wards should be reconfigured to form three three-member wards. It proposed that Sherwood ward be expanded northwards to include the hospital to the north of Valley Road and Longmead Drive area, currently in Basford ward, westwards to include the area to the north of Private Road and incorporating Woodthorpe Grange, currently in Mapperley ward, and the area between Hucknall and Mansfield roads, currently in Forest ward. It argued that this would unite “both sides of the district shopping centre along Mansfield Road” and reflect the natural community boundaries. It proposed an amended Mapperley ward, less the area to the north of Private Road, incorporating the northern parts of the existing St Ann’s and Greenwood wards, which it stated would incorporate all the residential areas of Mapperley Park, and the area to the south of Woodborough Road which “relates to the Mapperley area”. It proposed that the southern boundary should run along the centre of Elm Avenue, Cranmer Street, Woodborough Road, to the south of Hungerhill Gardens, along the centre of Ransom Road, St Bartholomew’s Road and Thorneywood Rise, Marmion Rise and Carlton Road. It proposed combining that part of Park ward to the east of Mansfield Road with the majority of Manvers ward (less the Sneinton area which it proposed transferring to the new Dales ward) to form a modified St Ann’s ward. The Council argued that this ward would “encompass the whole of the St Ann’s area of the city respecting the true boundaries of the community”. This would result in Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann’s wards having electoral variances of 3 per cent, 1 per cent and 6 per cent respectively (3 per cent, 2 per cent and 6 per cent in 2004) based on a council size of 54 members.

83 The Forum proposed three three-member wards covering this eastern area. It submitted modified boundaries for the existing Sherwood ward, extending it eastwards, southwards and northwards, but utilising Mansfield Road as the eastern boundary, stating that “a cluster of local areas and communities make up the proposed ward”. It proposed that the Mansfield Road should be used as the western boundary of an amended Mapperley ward, which would extend southwards to incorporate the northern parts of St Ann’s and Greenwood ward, arguing that it would combine similar communities and unite Mapperley Park within a single ward. The western part of the existing St Ann’s ward would then be combined with the majority of Manvers ward to create an amended St Ann’s ward, combining similar types of housing. Under the Forum’s scheme, Sherwood, Mapperley and St Ann’s wards would have 4 per cent, 2 per cent and 1 per cent more electors than the city average respectively (1 per cent and both equal to the average respectively in 2004).

84 The Conservatives proposed that the westernmost part of Manvers ward be combined with the northernmost part of Greenwood ward and easternmost part of St Ann’s ward, and renamed St Ann’s ward. They proposed that the remainder of the existing St Ann’s ward be combined with the northern area of Park ward, southern part of Radford ward and eastern part of Lenton ward to form a new Arboretum ward. They proposed expanding the existing Sherwood ward (less the southernmost part to be included in Forest ward) northwards and eastwards. Under their scheme the existing Mapperley ward would be extended southwards slightly, and the northernmost part of the existing Mapperley ward would be transferred to the amended Sherwood ward, as described earlier. While the proposed Mapperley and Sherwood wards would have electoral variances of 5 per cent or less both currently and in 2004, Arboretum ward would have 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently, improving to equal the city average in 2004, based on a 54-member council.

85 The Liberal Democrats proposed two two-member and two three-member wards for this western area of the city. They proposed that Sherwood ward be extended to incorporate the hospital, both sides of the Mansfield Road shopping area, and the Sherwood Rise area, currently in Forest ward, stating that this would “represent community identity”, and that it be represented by three councillors. They proposed modifying the boundaries of the existing Mapperley ward so that the northern area would be transferred to Sherwood ward and Mapperley ward would incorporate the northern part of Greenwood ward, but would retain two councillors. They proposed an amended St Ann’s ward, less the north-western area (to be transferred to Forest ward, as described earlier) and incorporating the northern area of Manvers ward, represented by an additional councillor. Manvers ward, under the Liberal Democrats’ scheme, would remain represented by two councillors, but would have the northern area transferred to St Ann’s ward, and would incorporate the northern part of Trent ward. They argue that this would “rebuild... the area known as Sneinton”. The resulting Manvers, Mapperley, Sherwood and St Ann’s wards would have electoral variances of 6 per cent, 12 per cent, 2 per cent and 6 per cent currently (3 per cent, 4 per cent, 1 per cent and 2 per cent) based on a 55-member council.

86 We received one other proposal for this area from Councillor Edwards, who stated that all the houses on Morley Avenue and Private Road should be united in Mapperley ward to better reflect community ties in the area. He also proposed that we should also consider transferring the properties on Gordon Rise and Maurice Drive for the same reason.

87 Having considered all the representations received, we have concluded that the warding arrangements put forward by the City Council best reflect community ties, while providing reasonable levels of electoral equality. In particular, we consider that Mansfield Road, which is the main shopping area in Sherwood, should be united within the amended Sherwood ward, as proposed by the City Council and Liberal Democrats. We consider that the Council’s proposed boundary between Mapperley and St Ann’s wards of Elm Avenue would unite the St Ann’s area in one ward, rather than dividing it between wards as the Conservatives and The Forum proposed, and would also largely unite the Mapperley area. We have considered Councillor Edwards’ proposal to include Morley Avenue, Private Road, Gordon Rise and Maurice Drive within Mapperley ward. However given the deterioration in electoral equality that would result from the proposal, for the purposes of consultation, we propose that these roads should remain part of Sherwood ward. We would, however, welcome views from interested parties at Stage Three. Under our draft recommendations, Mapperley, St Ann’s and Sherwood wards would have 5 per cent more, 4 per cent fewer and 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (5 per cent, 4 per cent and equal to the city average in 2004).

## **Electoral Cycle**

88 We received two representations regarding the City Council’s electoral cycle. The City Council supported its present system of elections for the entire council every four years, the Liberal Democrats requested that the city have elections by halves. The Forum and Conservatives mentioned the possibility of more frequent elections if directed by Parliament, but did not express a preference for any particular electoral cycle.

89 We have considered carefully these representations. Under current legislation, we are unable to recommend elections every two years. We are therefore content to support the City Council's preference for retaining the current electoral cycle of whole-council elections for the City Council. We would, however, welcome views from interested parties during Stage Three.

## **Conclusions**

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

- (a) a council of 55 members should be retained;
- (b) there should be 20 wards, seven fewer than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of 27 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of seven wards;
- (d) elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

91 Our draft recommendations would involve modifications to all of the existing wards in Nottingham City as summarised below:

- (a) we are putting forward the City Council's proposals for the wards of Berridge, Bestwood, Bulwell, Bulwell Forest, Dales, Mapperley, St Ann's, Sherwood and Vernon wards;
- (b) we are putting forward The Forum's proposed Dunkirk & Lenton and Clifton South wards;
- (c) our proposed Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey, Wollaton West and Clifton North wards are largely based on The Forum's proposals;
- (d) our proposed Bilborough, Crane and Leen Valley wards are largely based on the Council's proposals; and
- (e) we have put forward our own proposals for Arboretum, Bridge and Radford & Park wards.

92 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	55	55	55	55
Number of wards	27	20	27	20
Average number of electors per councillor	3,765	3,765	3,844	3,844
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	11	0	14	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	5	0	8	0

93 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Nottingham City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the city average from 11 to none. By 2004 no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average for the city.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Nottingham City Council should comprise 55 councillors serving 20 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. Elections should continue to be held for the whole Council.

**94 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Nottingham and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

*Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Nottingham*





## 5 NEXT STEPS

95 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Nottingham. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 21 February 1999. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

96 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

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

Fax: 020 7404 6142

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

97 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Nottingham: Detailed Mapping**

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

**Map A1** illustrates the proposed ward boundary between Clifton North and Clifton South wards.

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

*Map A1: The Proposed Ward Boundary between Clifton North and Clifton South wards*

## APPENDIX B

### Nottingham City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the City Council in a number of wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

*Figure B1: Nottingham City Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
Arboretum	Lenton ward (part); Park ward (part); Radford ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)
Berridge	Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Radford ward (part)
Bestwood	Basford ward; Bestwood Park ward (part); Byron ward (part)
Bilborough	Bilborough ward; Beechdale ward (part); Strelley ward (part)
Bulwell	Bulwell West ward; Bulwell East ward (part)
Bulwell Forest	Bulwell East ward (part); Byron ward (part); Portland ward (part)
Castle	Bridge ward (part); Park ward (part); Trent ward (part)
Clifton South	Clifton East ward (part); Clifton West ward (part)
Clifton North	Clifton East ward (part); Clifton West ward (part); Wilford ward (part)
Crane	Apsley ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part); Strelley ward (part).
Dales	Greenwood ward (part); Manvers ward (part); Trent ward (part)
Leen Valley	Beechdale ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part); Radford ward (part); Lenton ward (part)
Mapperley	Greenwood ward (part); Mapperley ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)
Priory	Abbey ward (part); Wollaton ward (part); Park ward (part); Bridge ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Sherwood	Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Mapperley ward (part); Sherwood ward (part)
St Ann's	Manvers ward (part); Park ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)
Vernon	Basford ward (part); Portland ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part); Radford ward (part)
Wollaton	Wollaton ward (part); Abbey ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)

Figure B2: Nottingham City Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Arboretum	3	10,644	3,548	-7	11,815	3,938	1
2	Berridge	3	12,257	4,086	7	12,241	4,080	4
3	Bestwood	3	11,656	3,885	1	11,587	3,862	-1
4	Bilborough	3	12,543	4,181	9	12,482	4,161	6
5	Bulwell	3	11,643	3,881	1	11,702	3,901	0
6	Bulwell Forest	3	11,314	3,771	-2	11,184	3,728	-5
7	Castle	3	10,965	3,655	-5	11,581	3,860	-1
8	Clifton North	3	11,224	3,741	-2	11,636	3,879	-1
9	Clifton South	3	10,089	3,363	-12	10,774	3,591	-8
10	Crane	3	12,148	4,049	6	12,043	4,014	2
11	Dales	3	11,511	3,837	0	12,006	4,002	2
12	Leen Valley	3	10,524	3,508	-9	11,463	3,821	-2
13	Mapperley	3	11,839	3,946	3	12,062	4,021	3
14	Priory	3	12,351	4,117	7	12,275	4,092	4
15	Sherwood	3	11,612	3,871	1	11,563	3,854	-2
16	St Ann's	3	10,818	3,606	-6	11,037	3,679	-6
17	Vernon	3	11,350	3,783	-1	11,598	3,866	-1
18	Wollaton	3	12,597	4,199	9	12,489	4,163	6
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>207,085</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>211,538</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,835</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,917</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Nottingham City Council's submission.

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

## Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B3: Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Aspley & Whitemoor	Aspley ward (part); Robin Hood (part); Portland ward (part)
Basford	Basford ward (part); Portland ward (part); Bestwood ward (part); Byron ward (part)
Beechdale & Bilborough	Beechdale ward; Bilborough ward (part)
Bestwood & Top Valley	Bestwood Park ward (part); Byron ward (part)
Broxtowe & Strelley	Strelley ward; Aspley ward (part)
Bulwell East	Bullwell East ward (part); Portland ward (part)
Bulwell West	Bullwell West ward; Bullwell East ward (part); Portland ward (part)
Clifton North & Wilford	Wilford ward; Clifton East ward (part); Clifton West ward (part)
Clifton South	Clifton East ward (part); Clifton West ward (part)
Dunkirk & Lenton	Abbey ward (part); Park ward (part)
Forest Fields	St Ann's ward (part); Forest Fields ward (part)
Lenton Abbey & Wollaton East	Wollaton ward (part); Abbey ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Mapperley	Sherwood ward (part); Mapperley ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Greenwood ward (part)
Radford North	Radford ward; Lenton ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Radford South	Lenton ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Sherwood	Sherwood ward (part); Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part)
Sneinton & Bakersfield	Greenwood ward (part); Trent ward (part); Manvers ward (part)
St Ann's	Manvers ward (part); Greenwood ward (part); St Ann's ward (part)
The Meadows & Riverside	Trent ward (part); Bridge ward (part); Abbey ward (part)
The Park & City Centre	Bridge ward (part); Park ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Trent ward (part)
Wollaton West	Wollaton ward (part); Abbey ward (part); Bilborough ward (part)

Figure B4: Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Aspley, Stockhill & Whitemoor	3	11,543	3,848	2	11,708	3,903	1
2	Basford	3	11,456	3,819	1	11,444	3,815	-1
3	Beechdale & Bilborough	3	11,631	3,877	3	11,580	3,860	0
4	Bestwood & Top Valley	3	11,528	3,843	2	11,416	3,805	-1
5	Broxtowe & Strelley	2	7,834	3,917	4	7,761	3,881	1
6	Bulwell East	2	7,926	3,963	5	7,950	3,975	3
7	Bulwell West	3	11,308	3,769	0	11,302	3,767	-2
8	Clifton North & Wilford	3	10,733	3,578	-5	11,147	3,716	-3
9	Clifton South	3	10,580	3,527	-6	11,167	3,722	-3
10	Dunkirk & Lenton	2	7,985	3,993	6	7,966	3,983	4
11	Forest Fields	2	7,506	3,753	0	7,534	3,767	-2
12	Lenton Abbey & Wollaton East	2	6,866	3,433	-9	7,547	3,774	-2
13	Mapperley	3	11,501	3,834	2	11,531	3,844	0
14	Radford North	3	11,211	3,737	-1	11,661	3,887	1
15	Radford South	2	7,681	3,841	2	8,082	4,041	5
16	Sherwood	3	11,769	3,923	4	11,698	3,899	1
17	Sneinton & Bakersfield	3	12,003	4,001	6	12,111	4,037	5
18	St Ann's	3	11,353	3,784	1	11,532	3,844	0
19	The Meadows & Riverside	2	7,269	3,635	-3	7,587	3,794	-1



Figure B4: Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
20	The Park & City Centre	2	5,508	2,754	-27	7,019	3,510	-9
21	Wollaton West	3	11,894	3,965	5	11,794	3,931	2
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>207,085</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>211,537</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,765</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,846</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on Dunkirk & Lenton Partnership Forum's submission.

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

## City of Nottingham Conservative Federation's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Figure B5: City of Nottingham Conservative Federation's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Arboretum	St Ann's ward (part); Radford ward (part); Lenton ward (part); Park ward (part)
Aspley	Aspley ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Basford	Basford ward (part); Portland ward (part); Byron ward (part)
Beechdale	Beechdale ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Bestwood	Bestwood Park ward; Byron ward (part)
Bilborough	Bilborough ward; Beechdale ward (part)
Bulwell	Bulwell East ward (part); Bulwell West ward (part)
Byron	Byron ward (part)
Cinderhill	Bulwell West ward (part); Portland ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Clifton East	Clifton East ward (part); Clifton West ward (part); Wilford ward
Clifton West	Clifton West ward (part)
Forest	Forest ward (part); Sherwood ward (part)
Greenwood	Greenwood ward; Trent ward (part)
Highbury	Bulwell East ward (part); Portland ward (part)
Hyson Green	Radford ward (part); Forest ward (part)
Mapperley	Mapperley ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Greenwood ward (part)
Park	Park ward (part)
Radford	Lenton ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Raleigh	Abbey ward (part); Lenton ward (part); Robin Hood ward (part)
Riverside	Bridge ward (part); Trent ward (part)
Sherwood	Sherwood ward (part); Basford ward (part); Mapperley ward (part)
Sneinton	Trent ward (part); Manvers ward (part)
St Ann's	Manvers ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Greenwood ward (part)
Strelley	Strelley ward; Aspley ward (part)
University	Abbey ward (part); Wollaton ward (part)
Wilford	Wilford ward (part); Clifton East ward (part)
Wollaton	Wollaton ward (part)

*Figure B6: City of Nottingham Conservative Federation's: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (1999)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>	<b>Electorate (2004)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>
1	Arboretum	2	6,807	3,404	-13	7,804	3,902	0
2	Aspley	2	7,869	3,935	0	7,826	3,913	0
3	Basford	2	7,976	3,988	2	7,913	3,957	1
4	Beechdale	2	7,532	3,766	-4	7,505	3,753	-4
5	Bestwood	2	7,868	3,934	0	7,832	3,916	0
6	Bilborough	2	8,037	4,019	2	7,966	3,983	2
7	Bulwell	2	7,507	3,754	-4	7,560	3,780	-4
8	Byron	2	7,816	3,908	-1	7,739	3,870	-1
9	Cinderhill	2	7,799	3,900	-1	8,055	4,028	3
10	Clifton East	2	7,560	3,780	-4	7,560	3,780	-4
11	Clifton West	2	6,324	3,162	-20	7,424	3,712	-5
12	Forest	2	8,064	4,032	3	8,098	4,049	3
13	Greenwood	2	7,616	3,808	-3	7,822	3,911	0
14	Highbury	2	8,259	4,130	5	8,220	4,110	5
15	Hyson Green	2	7,616	3,808	-3	7,782	3,891	-1
16	Mapperley	2	8,238	4,119	5	8,252	4,126	5
17	Park	2	6,847	3,424	-13	7,666	3,833	-2
18	Radford	2	7,534	3,767	-4	7,942	3,971	1
19	Raleigh	2	7,132	3,566	-9	7,819	3,910	0
20	Riverside	2	7,522	3,761	-4	7,840	3,920	0
21	Sherwood	2	8,030	4,015	2	8,002	4,001	2
22	Sneinton & Bakersfield	2	7,405	3,703	-6	7,831	3,916	0
23	St Ann's	2	8,271	4,136	5	8,223	4,112	5
24	Strelley	2	7,834	3,917	0	7,761	3,881	-1
25	University	2	7,987	3,994	2	7,920	3,960	1

*Figure B6: City of Nottingham Conservative Federation's: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (1999)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>	<b>Electorate (2004)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average (%)</b>
26	Wilford	2	7,425	3,713	-5	7,356	3,678	-6
27	Wollaton	2	7,856	3,928	0	7,819	3,910	0
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>206,731</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>211,537</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,828</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,917</b>	<b>-</b>

*Source: Electorate figures are based on City of Nottingham Conservative Federation's submission.*

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

## City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats' Proposed Electoral Arrangements

*Figure B7: City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats: Constituent Areas*

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
Abbey	Abbey ward (part); Park ward (part); Wollaton ward (part)
Aspley & Stockhill	Aspley ward (part); Portland ward (part); Beechdale ward (part)
Basford	Portland ward (part); Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Radford ward (part)
Bestwood Park	Bestwood Park ward; Basford ward (part)
Bilborough	Bilborough ward (part); Beechdale ward (part)
Bridge	Trent ward (part); Bridge ward; Wilford ward (part)
Bulwell South	Bulwell East ward (part); Bulwell West ward (part); Portland ward (part)
Bulwell North	Bulwell East ward (part); Bulwell West ward (part)
Byron	Byron ward; Basford ward (part)
Clifton East	Clifton East ward; Clifton West ward (part); Wilford ward (part)
Clifton West	Clifton West ward (part)
Forest	St Ann's ward (part); Forest ward (part); Radford ward (part)
Greenwood	Greenwood ward (part)
Lenton	Lenton ward (part)
Manvers	Trent ward (part); Manvers ward (part)
Mapperley	Mapperley ward (part); Greenwood ward (part)
Park	Park ward (part); Lenton ward (part)
Robin Hood	Robin Hood ward; Beechdale ward (part)
Sherwood	Sherwood ward; Basford ward (part); Forest ward (part); Mapperley ward (part)
Strelley	Strelley ward; Beechdale ward (part); Aspley ward (part)
Victoria	Park ward (part); St Ann's ward (part); Manvers ward (part)
Wollaton	Wollaton ward (part); Bilborough ward (part); Abbey ward (part)

Figure B8: City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
1	Abbey	3	11,581	3,860	3	11,489	3,830	0
2	Aspley & Stockley	2	7,891	3,946	5	7,891	3,946	3
3	Basford	3	11,197	3,732	-1	11,406	3,802	-1
4	Bestwood Park	2	7,731	3,866	3	7,701	3,851	0
5	Bilborough	2	7,989	3,995	6	7,936	3,968	3
6	Bridge	3	10,637	3,546	-6	10,972	3,657	-5
7	Bulwell North	2	7,732	3,866	3	7,782	3,891	1
8	Bulwell South	3	11,649	3,883	3	11,616	3,872	1
9	Byron	3	11,014	3,671	-2	10,910	3,637	-5
10	Clifton East	3	12,144	4,048	8	12,023	4,008	4
11	Clifton West	2	7,216	3,608	-4	8,353	4,177	9
12	Forest	3	11,199	3,733	-1	11,402	3,801	-1
13	Greenwood	2	7,225	3,613	-4	7,213	3,607	-6
14	Lenton	2	6,835	3,418	-9	7,508	3,754	-2
15	Manvers	2	7,970	3,985	6	7,898	3,949	3
16	Mapperley	2	7,805	3,903	4	7,879	3,940	3
17	Park	2	6,420	3,210	-15	7,278	3,639	-5
18	Robin Hood	3	10,901	3,634	-3	11,554	3,851	0
19	Sherwood	3	11,964	3,988	6	11,987	3,996	4

Figure B8: City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average (%)
20	Strelley	2	7,886	3,943	5	7,813	3,907	2
21	St Ann's	3	10,683	3,561	-5	11,328	3,776	-2
22	Wollaton	3	11,390	3,797	1	11,294	3,765	-2
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>207,059</b>	-	-	<b>211,233</b>	-	-
	<b>Averages</b>	-	-	<b>3,765</b>	-	-	<b>3,841</b>	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on City of Nottingham Liberal Democrats' submission.

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





## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;

---

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

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

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

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

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

7 In relation to shire districts:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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