

# Licensing & Regulatory Committee

Excerpt of the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 31 October 2016, at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 2.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillor Illingworth (Chairman); Councillors Ashford, Boad, Mrs Cain, Mrs Falp, Gallagher, Miss Grainger, Quinney, Mrs Redford, Mrs Stevens and Weed.

## 16. **Apologies and Substitutes**

- a) Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Davies and Councillor Gill; and
- b) Councillor Boad substituted for Councillor Gifford.

## 17. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made relating to the minutes contained within this excerpt.

## 18. **Proposed Boundary Review of Warwick District Council Wards & Community Governance Review of Parish and Town Council Boundaries/Wards within Warwick District**

The Committee considered a report from the Chief Executive which brought forward a proposal for a combined review of Warwick District Council Ward boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), together with a Community Governance Review of all Parish/Town Council boundaries (and their Wards) by Warwick District Council, in light of electoral inequality across the District and the lack of coterminous boundaries.

The Licensing & Regulatory Committee was responsible for "all the powers and duties of the Council relating to Parliamentary Elections and Boundary Reviews". This included requesting a review of the Ward boundary arrangements for WDC. However, the advice from the Council's Solicitors was that to avoid any potential challenge of decision, this should be a decision taken by Council because of the proposed reduction in the number of Councillors. Section 8 of this report set out the broad guidelines that the LGBCE would follow during such a review.

The last Boundary Review of Warwick District came into force at the combined District, Town and Parish Council elections held in May 2015. Under the previous review of Warwick District Wards, the LGBCE set a District average ratio of 2313 electors per Councillor, with an acceptable variance of +/- 10% from the average. This was based upon the request (at the time) from this Council to retain 46 Councillors.

However, it was clear that there were two issues now arising which strongly suggested that a further review should be requested by this Council. Firstly, the level of electoral growth in the District had already surpassed the level predicted by the LGBCE for 2018. This growth had already resulted in three District Wards exceeding the acceptable 10% variance from the average for the ratio of electors to Councillors. It was forecast that the number of District Wards out of tolerance would grow even further by the time of the next District elections, thus undermining the principle of electoral equality, i.e. that no matter the ward, all

votes had equal (or as near as practically possible) weight in terms of the number of representatives that could be elected. Secondly, this Council had sought to establish and maintain the principle of coterminous boundaries at all levels of electoral representation. This had now been seriously breached by the implications of the LGCE proposals for the WCC Divisions for Town Council Wards in the three largest towns in the District.

During the last review, strong representations were made by the Council over anticipated growth/development, especially to the south of the District. This was not accepted by the LGCE because at that time development had not started, nor was the Local Plan at a significantly advanced stage for all of its proposals to be taken into account. The Local Plan had now progressed with a number of large developments already approved, built or under construction. This development, combined with a general increase in the number of people registered to vote, had resulted in the ratio of electors to Councillors in three wards in this area already exceeding the tolerance level of 10% set by the LGCE.

Appendix 1, to the report, illustrated the forecasted growth in the electorate across Warwick District over the next five years using a number of different, but linked data sets, including the Register of Electors, population growth forecasts, forecasts from the LGCE and the level of approved development in the District. All of these sources indicated significant electoral growth in Warwick District over the next five years up to 2021, with the lowest estimate predicting a further 2,000 electors and the highest estimate predicting an increase of 8,000 electors.

Appendix 2, to the report, provided an overview of the number of electors per ward as outlined in the 2013 LGCE review of Warwick District. It also provided the current status of each ward and detailed how they compared in relation to the acceptable variance from the approved ratio of 2313 electors to one Councillor, as approved by the LGCE for 2018.

In order to challenge the levels predicted by the LGCE for WDC in 2018 and seek an early Boundary Review, the Council needed to demonstrate/evidence the significant level of growth expected in order for the Council to seek an early review of its boundaries. This early review would need to be agreed by the LGCE. Therefore, it was important to cross reference the level of growth anticipated in the District against the values set by the LGCE for 2018.

Ideally, the Council would include a comparison of the anticipated electorate in Warwick District in 2020, as predicated by the LGCE as part of their review of Warwickshire County Council Divisions. However, the Council did not have this data broken down by current WDC Ward.

As shown in the report, Table 1 of the report, illustrated the current percentage variances from the ratio of Councillors to Electors set for this Council's wards by the LGCE for 2018 for the present value and predicted electoral growth up to 2021.

Those wards of immediate concern were Brunswick, Manor and Saltisford, because they already exceeded the 2018 electorate predicted by the LGCE. However, the table also showed predicted level variances for each ward in 2018 and 2021, and thus illustrated how many more wards would fall out of the tolerance levels by these dates.

The importance of contrasting WDC's position to the LGBCE forecast was primarily that the Council needed an agreement from the LGBCE to undertake the review. The argument that had to be put forward was that its previous estimates now differed significantly from the current reality and as a consequence, the principle of electoral equality had been seriously compromised as demonstrated by the key points that the data in Appendix 2 to the report showed:

- (i) the total electorate for Warwick District was already at a greater level than that predicted by the LGBCE for 2018;
- (ii) three WDC wards already had an electorate greater than 10% of the ratio of Councillor to electorate predicted by the LGBCE for 2018;
- (iii) based on current approved development, it was forecast that by 2018, 10 of 22 District Wards would be outside the tolerance accepted by the LGBCE, with two wards at least 19% above the average ratio, and that by 2021 there would be three wards at 25% or greater of the average ratio; and,
- (iv) the level of approved development within Warwick District would see further significant increases in the electorate across the District in the period to 2021.

In the last review, this Council committed itself to the principle of coterminous electoral boundaries, wherever reasonably practicable, to ensure clarity of representation for communities and also to enhance community identity.

The LGBCE decision on WCC Divisions conflicted significantly with the District Council Ward Boundaries. The proposals for the WCC Divisions radically altered some of the Town and Parish Council ward boundaries, resulting in a large number of small wards in the three largest towns in the District. This was a direct result of WCC Division and WDC Ward Boundaries not being coterminous, and the requirement under legislation for Town/Parish Council Ward Boundaries not to cross a District Ward or WCC Division Boundary.

The outcome of the revised WCC Division Boundaries was not conducive to making participation in elections easy for the community, when in the WDC area the District Council had its elections at the same time as the Parish/Town Councils, whilst WCC did not. The problem this created was that, if unchanged, at the next set of local elections in 2019, the wards for the District Council and the Town Councils of the three largest towns would be on different boundaries. In the Returning Officer's view, this was a recipe for voter confusion, would deter electoral participation, create more difficulties for electoral administration, and make it harder for candidates and their supporters to engage effectively with the electorate. None of this would be good for local democracy.

A copy of the following plans were attached to the report:

- the current WDC Ward Boundaries, at Appendix 3;
- the current Parish & Town Council Boundaries, along with their wards, at Appendix 4;
- the approved WCC Division Boundaries for 2017, at Appendix 5; and
- the proposed Town/Parish Wards and Boundaries, at Appendix 6.

The LGBCE had previously informed this Council that it would not reconsider the boundaries within the District without radical proposals for change coming forward. The Returning Officer considered that the prospect of significant electoral inequality and the outcome of the review of County Council Division

Boundaries had made a further review necessary, including the consideration of radical alternative options.

Given that this Council could not ask for the County Division Boundaries to be reviewed, the only options available to the District Council were to either:

- do nothing, which for the reasons stated above would be contrary to achieving effective electoral equality and the Council's own disposition to seek coterminous electoral boundaries at all levels of representation; or,
- seek to re-set the District and Parish/Town Council Ward Boundaries to be on those of the new County Council Divisions (14). This would mean that in retaining 3 Councillors per ward, the overall number of Councillors would be reduced from 46 to 42.

Having undertaken an assessment of the implication of having 14 wards, based on the WCC Divisions, with three District Councillors for each ward, the ratio provided would be 2574 electors to each Councillor. The ratio of WDC Councillors to electors had been set using the LGBCE predicted electorate for Warwick District as at 2020, according to their review of WCC Divisions. This ratio would place the Budbrooke and Bishop's Tachbrook ward significantly out of tolerance within five years. This analysis was outlined at Appendix 8 to the report.

Therefore, it was considered more logical for the Council to seek a reduction to 43 Councillors with 15 wards. The additional ward would be formed by splitting the Budbrooke and Bishop's Tachbrook Division area in half and having two District Councillors to represent each of these wards. The Budbrooke Ward would comprise of the Parishes of Budbrooke, Norton Lindsey, Shrewley and Hatton. The Bishop's Tachbrook Ward would comprise of the parishes of Bishop's Tachbrook, Barford, Sherbourne and Wasperton. This adjustment would result in an average ratio of 2513 electors per Councillor, and all wards being well within 10% tolerance during the next five years. This ratio was set using the LGBCE predicted electorate for Warwick District as at 2020. The analysis of this information was set out at Appendix 9 to the report.

In addition, it was suggested that the Lapworth and West Kenilworth Division area be split into two District Wards, to enable Kenilworth town to retain its coterminous electoral boundaries. The two District Wards would be formed thus: one covering the majority of the current Kenilworth Abbey ward and Burton Green Parish Council area, represented by two Councillors, and the other formed by the parishes of Beausale, Hasely, Honiley & Wroxall, Baddesley Clinton, Rowington, Bushwood and Lapworth, represented by a single Councillor. This geographical split was commensurate with the Council's principle of coterminous electoral boundaries. These proposals would lead to the District Council being made up of 16 wards.

Appendix 7 to the report provided a comparison across the Council's 15 nearest CIPFA neighbours, as well as the four other Districts/Boroughs of Warwickshire. The data was in order of ratio of electors to Councillors, and demonstrated that the recommended proposal from the Council would be reasonable and in-line with its nearest CIPFA neighbours.

It was considered good practice to make the County Council and all Parish & Town Councils aware of the revised boundary proposals by the District Council at an early stage, so that they had sufficient notice to engage in the process fully. This would also enable them to make a request to the Returning Officer regarding any boundary issues that they would like the Council to consider.

Recommendation 2.4 had been brought forward, after discussion with the LGBCE, to ensure that at the very least the related alterations would bring District and Parish/Town Boundaries in line with each other wherever possible.

The Council was required to evidence what impact, if any, a proposed reduction in the number of Councillors would have on the Council. This had been considered and the impact of the potential reduction of the size of the Council by three Councillors. The Council did not believe this would impact upon its governance framework and ability for democratic responsibilities. This was because this small reduction in the number of Councillors could be accommodated because at present some Councillors had few if any Committee responsibilities and in addition, the Council had experienced, since 2013, some Councillors being away from the authority for several months (for various reasons) without it impacting on the wider workload of Councillors. While there might be a small increase in workload, it would in essence be spread amongst the Wards of Kenilworth, Leamington and Warwick. In addition, this process would be aided through there being coterminous boundaries which would enable improved cross Council working for Councillors.

A separate report on the agenda set out the proposed new Parliamentary Boundaries. In the context of the argument above regarding coterminous boundaries, it was suggested in that other report that the Council should make representations to make sure that the Parliamentary Boundary Review took into account the review proposed by this Council, to ensure that coterminous boundaries were applied to all levels of electoral representation and used the same boundaries. This would then help to avoid some of the current confusion that the local community had to experience, such as in the areas around Hopton Crofts and New Cubbington.

As an alternative option the Council could consider maintaining the status quo, i.e. stay as it was, this was not considered a realistic option for the reasons set out in section 3 of the report.

Another alternative option could have been given to realigning Warwick District wards with Warwickshire County Council Divisions, but subdividing them into smaller wards of equal number of electors, each represented by a Councillor. This had been proposed in so far as it has remained compatible with achieving coterminous boundaries and achieving electoral equality for Lapworth and Kenilworth West and for Budbrooke and Bishop's Tachbrook. However, further subdivision was not considered appropriate as it was not believed that this could be achieved whilst retaining an appropriate ratio of electors to Councillors and the current Town/Parish Council Boundaries.

Another alternative option could have been given for having two District Councillors representing each County Division. However, this would have led to a significant increase in workload for Councillors and could potentially have given rise to a full time role, with a similar ratio of electors to Councillors as in single tier and County authorities. Councillors would need to understand that this would be a much more radical change to their role if they chose to pursue this option. It was also unlikely that this route would generate much in the way of financial saving, as officers predicted that Member Allowances would need to increase significantly and would likely offset any saving that might be made by reducing the overall number of Councillors. For all of these reasons, this option was not recommended.

The Council could alternatively consider deviating from the coterminous boundary principle and redrawing boundaries it felt were appropriate based on a ratio of electors to Councillors that best met the needs of the community. This option was not brought forward because of the issues discussed in section 3 of the report. In addition, there were a number of historic Parishes within the District that the Council would not wish to impact upon by drawing boundaries which could result in new Parish Boundaries or "Warding" of these Parishes.

The Committee should be mindful that a Parish/Town Ward cannot cross a District Ward or a County Divisional Boundary. Therefore, amending these Boundaries, depending on the election to take place, would not have been permissible nor would it have been approved by the LGBCE, who had to provide consent for the change of a Parish/Town Boundary or Ward if a change had been made to that Boundary within the previous five years.

The Deputy Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services Manager explained that there was a formulaic error within the data for Appendix 8 which did not significantly alter the information provided and this would be revised before submission.

Members of the Committee had concerns that if the Council was committed to coterminous boundaries this should apply at all levels of election and therefore at Parish level this should include New Cubbington and Whitnash East wards. This was proposed duly seconded and

Recommended to Council that:

- (1) it should approach the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) to undertake a review of Warwick District Council (WDC) Ward Boundaries, and alongside it this Council undertakes a Community Governance Review of all Parish/Town Council boundaries (and their wards), in the light of electoral inequality across the District and the lack of coterminous boundaries, as explained in Section 3 of the report;
- (2) the proposal to be put to the LGBCE is for the WDC Ward Boundaries and names to follow those of the Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Divisional Boundaries within the District, with each ward having three WDC Councillors, except for:
  - (a) the Budbrooke & Bishop's Tachbrook Division which should be split into two District Wards, each represented by two District Councillors – one to be named Budbrooke and the other Bishop's Tachbrook; and
  - (b) the Lapworth and Kenilworth West Division which should be split into two wards; one ward will cover the current Warwick District Kenilworth Abbey Ward area (to be represented by two District Councillors) and the other ward will represent the remaining rural area to be known as Lapworth, represented by one District Councillor.

- (3) subject to approval of (1) and (2) by Council, the Chief Executive is asked to notify WCC and all Parish & Town Councils within Warwick District of this Council's intention to approach the LGBCE, outlining the proposed principles of the review and seeking views on any specific issues relating to the proposed boundary revisions and/or revised electoral arrangements, which would include:
  - (i) A proposal to move the area of New Cubbington Parish Ward into Royal Leamington Spa;
  - (ii) A proposal that the area of Whitnash East Town Ward is moved into Royal Leamington Spa;
  
- (4) if the LGBCE does not approve the request for a Boundary Review of Warwick District or that this review will not be completed until after the 2019 elections, the Chief Executive is authorised to
  - (a) Bring related alterations forward to ensure where possible the revisions made under the previous community governance order are coterminous with the District Wards;
  - (b) Bring forward the necessary Community Governance orders to amend the Town Council Wards in line with the requirements of the WCC Divisions review order.
  
- (5) in the submission of a request to the LGBCE the Chief Executive outlines the reasons why the Council does not feel the reduction of three Councillors will impact on its ability to operate democratically or for the Councillors to represent the local community effectively, as outlined in paragraph 3.23 of the report.

*(After the vote on this item had been taken Councillors Mrs Cain, Mrs Falp, Illingworth and Stevens asked for their votes (against this proposal due to the wording of (3)) to be recorded in the minutes.*

## 19. **Community Governance Review - Heathcote Area**

The Committee considered a report from Democratic Services that proposed minor amendments to the Parish/Town boundaries of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council, Warwick Town Council, and Whitnash Town Council.

The Licensing & Regulatory Committee was responsible for "All the powers and duties of the Council relating to Parliamentary Elections and Boundary Reviews". This included amendments to the boundaries of Parish and Town Councils as part of Community Governance Order.

The last Community Governance Review was completed in August 2014 and came into force for the Town and Parish Council elections held in May 2015.

That review concluded that changes were required to the boundaries within the Heathcote estate, but only when these could be coterminous with WDC Boundaries. However, it was not possible to amend the District Council

Boundaries prior to the May 2015 election. Therefore, these Parish/Town Council changes were placed on hold because it would impact on a large number of electors and would cause confusion.

Since then, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) had completed a review of the Warwickshire County Council (WCC) Divisions with conclusions that were consistent with the Community Governance Order, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report.

Before the Council could confirm the order it needed consent from the LGBCE, because these boundaries had been amended within the last five years. It was understood that this request would be supported by the LGBCE because the WCC Divisions it had already agreed followed the same boundaries now proposed.

If this decision was confirmed by the Committee, it would make the boundaries coterminous with WCC Divisions. This would support the other proposal on this agenda to bring the WDC ward boundaries into a coterminous arrangement with the relevant Parish/Town Councils.

Warwick Town Council, Whitnash Town Council, Councillor Andrew Day (the Ward Councillor for Bishop's Tachbrook) and Councillor Mrs Falp (one of the Ward Councillors for Whitnash), had been re-consulted and supported the proposal. No objections or comments had been received from any of the other consultees.

Recommendation 2.2 was only included as a fall-back position, to mitigate the complicated electoral boundaries in this area, in case the wider review of the District boundaries was not approved or was not completed by May 2019.

**Resolved that**

- (1) subject to the consent of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), the order is made that the boundaries of Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council, Warwick Town Council and Whitnash Town Council be amended, as set out in the Community Governance Order at Appendix 1 to the report;
- (2) if the Council's request for a review of its ward boundaries is not approved by the LGBCE or will not be complete by May 2019, the Council seeks a related alternation to amend the Warwick District Council ward boundaries, in line with the proposals of the Community Governance Order, to take effect from May 2019; and
- (3) once the order is confirmed, all households affected by the order, along with the relevant Parish and Town Councils and respective Warwick District Ward Councillors and County Councillors, be notified in writing of the change in Parish/Town Council representation.



20. **Record of Licensing & Regulatory Panel Hearings**

The minutes of the Licensing & Regulatory Panel Hearings on 15 March 2016, 22 March 2016, 3 May 2016, 10 May 2016, 11 May 2016 and 17 May 2016 were noted.

21. **Public & Press**

**Resolved** that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item by reason of the likely disclosure of exempt information within paragraphs 1 and 2 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006,

22. **Record of Licensing & Regulatory Panel Hearings**

The confidential minutes of the Licensing & Regulatory Panel Hearings on 22 September 2015, 20 October 2015, 9 November 2015, 3 December 2015, 23 February 2016, 10 March 2016, 22 March 2016 and 7 April 2016 were noted.

23. **2018 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies**

The Committee considered a report from the Chief Executive that set out a proposed response to the Initial Proposals for the new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the West Midlands.

The Licensing & Regulatory Committee was responsible for "All the powers and duties of the Council relating to Parliamentary Elections and Boundary Reviews". This included responding to the Parliamentary Boundary Review Consultation.

The Committee was advised to consider the proposals and how these impacted on the local communities that it represented. However, without significant analysis of the electoral numbers across the region, it would not be appropriate for this Council to bring forward significantly different alternative proposals. Officers were not in a position to undertake this wider significant analysis and, therefore, this report confined itself to impacts on the local community and this Council.

The Boundary Commission for England had set out the criteria for the points that would be considered as part of a submission. It discouraged submissions based on potential boundary changes and instead sought to use the District Ward boundaries that were in place in May 2015. As such, the proposed submission from this Council would not fall within this criterion. Even so, it was clear that there were some issues of principle about the proposals that the Council should raise; specifically, the impact of the proposals on the local community and the significant changes coming forward relating to the Review of Warwick District Council Boundaries, as set out in minute 18.

The review of Parliamentary Constituencies stemmed from the desire by Government to reduce the number of MPs and to achieve greater electoral equality. That was, that each constituency should have the same number of voters in ratio to an MP. Currently that was not the case. Whilst electoral

equality was a major concern, there were also other important aspects. These were:

- a. That a constituency should reflect the integrity of recognisable geographic and economically linked communities. A constituency devised simply to make numbers balance out was a poor basis for Parliamentary democracy.
- b. That the electoral number upon which the constituencies were devised should properly reflect development growth and improved electoral registration so that electoral equality could be sustained for at least the period to the General Election in 2025, without requiring a further significant boundary review. There was little point in not looking far enough ahead whilst undertaking a review because it would inevitably result in electoral inequality and the need for another costly review in short order.
- c. That the same electoral boundaries were used to construct a constituency as those of County Divisions, District Wards and Parish Council or Parish ward boundaries, to avoid voter confusion.

However, the proposals relating to the constituencies proposed to cover the area of Warwick District generated issues on all three points above, as follows:

- a. The proposals split two towns (Warwick and Royal Leamington Spa) that had been within the same Parliamentary Constituency since the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. More importantly, the towns physically adjoined each other and had considerable economic, environmental and community links. The proposals also split the town of Warwick by placing one of its District Wards (Myton and Heathcote) within the Kenilworth and Leamington Constituency.
- b. The proposals did not allow for the growth in the electorate that this Council had forecast even over the period to 2020, let alone beyond it. The proposals used 97,930 as a base and at the EU Referendum the parliamentary electorate in the District was 103,195. This was the estimated level predicted by the LGBCE for 2018 (estimated register of 106,305 less circa 3,000 EU voters) and by 2020 this was estimated to rise to circa 105,000. However, Warwick District Council estimated that electorate growth (based on proposed development) would see its Parliamentary electorate rise to between 106,000 and 109,000 by 2020. Whilst there were variables within these calculations, the current disparity was significantly large.

It was recognised that Warwick District was growing and so was the electorate. There were two consequences arising from this disparity; one was that electoral equality would not, in fact, be achieved and the other was that it would not be maintained for very long if it was achieved. This would lead to another review with all the cost that this involved and the uncertainty created about representation, neither of which should be overlooked at this time.

There was a much wider national point at stake. As a result of voter engagement as part of the EU Referendum, there had been a significant increase in registered electors within Warwick District. If this was reflected in other areas across the region or country, it could impact on the calculations of having an electorate per MP in the region of 75,000. This, if replicated at the same or greater scale across the country, had the potential to create more enduring and significant electoral inequality.

- c. This Council had continually sought coterminous electoral boundaries and was proposing a series of changes to District Wards and Town Council Wards to avoid what officers foresaw as a significant problem of voter confusion. Unless the Boundary Commission took these proposals up, the Parliamentary elections of 2020 would be fought on one set of boundaries which would be different to those used the year before (2019) in the District and Town/Parish Council elections. This ought not to be a significant obstacle for the Boundary Commission because even if it did not change the proposals substantively, it could make this change without prejudicing the balance of electoral numbers.

This latter point was relevant to whatever geography was agreed for the Parliamentary Constituencies. The basic building blocks should be the electoral boundaries of parishes, District and County Division boundaries. If this principle was applied, then the potential for voter confusion would be minimised or avoided altogether.

It was worth highlighting to Members that should the Boundary Commission address the Council's concerns about the towns of Warwick and Leamington being in different Parliamentary Constituencies, this would have a consequence elsewhere; namely that Kenilworth and the immediate surrounding parishes were likely to then be part of a different constituency. The alternative geographical options were limited but could include Kenilworth becoming part of a constituency with either; the southern part of Coventry, which given the mutual links with the University could have some merit; Balsall Common and Meriden etc, as was previously proposed; with Rugby, as was the case in the past; or with the Southam area, as was currently the case.

If the Boundary Commission decided to continue using the current WDC Ward boundaries, then two points should be made:

1. That the Myton and Heathcote Ward should be part of the Warwick and Stratford constituency, and not the Kenilworth and Leamington constituency, because the Ward was firmly part of the town of Warwick.
2. That the other related changes which were the subject of two other reports on this agenda must also be recognised by the Boundary Commission in their eventual proposals.

The Members of the Committee individually had concerns about the proposals from the Boundary Commission and the impact of these on the local community. While in principle they all supported the recommendations proposed within the report, they considered that the wording needed to be amended to ensure clarity and priority of the Council's view.

**Resolved** that the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, to finalise the wording for the Council's submission to the Boundary Commission regarding the Initial Proposals for new Parliamentary Constituency boundaries in the West Midlands, that:

- (1) Myton & Heathcote Ward should be in the constituency that covers the rest of the Town of Warwick;

- (2) Warwick & Leamington Spa should be included within a single constituency, recognising the special economic and historic link between the towns;
- (3) the review should be mindful of the proposals for a review of Warwick District Boundaries to be in place by 2019. Therefore, any proposals for 2020 should be coterminous with these because this would provide coterminous electoral boundaries from Parish to Parliament; and
- (4) the Commission should seek to verify its electoral registration figures because of increases that may have occurred in some wards due to improved registration and the EU Referendum.

(The meeting ended at 3.50 pm)