

 <b>WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL</b>	<b>Licensing &amp; Regulatory Committee</b> <b>21 August 2014.</b>	<b>Agenda Item No. 5</b>
<b>Title</b>	Warwick District Community Governance Review	
<b>For further information about this report please contact</b>	Chris Elliott, Chief Executive <a href="mailto:chris.elliott@warwick">chris.elliott@warwick</a> , 01926 456000	
<b>Wards of the District directly affected</b>	All	
<b>Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006?</b>	No	
<b>Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number</b>	Regulatory Committee on 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2013, 12 <sup>th</sup> November 2013, 28 <sup>th</sup> January 2014; 4 Informal Meetings of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee held in July 2014, Licensing & Regulatory Committee 18 September 2014	
<b>Background Papers</b>		

<b>Contrary to the policy framework:</b>	No
<b>Contrary to the budgetary framework:</b>	No
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No
<b>Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number)</b>	No
<b>Equality Impact Assessment Undertaken</b>	No

<b>Officer/Councillor Approval</b>		
<b>Officer Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>
Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive	14.10.14	Chris Elliott
Head of Service	14.10.14	Graham Leach
CMT		
Section 151 Officer	14.10.14	Mike Snow
Monitoring Officer		
Finance	14.10.14	Mike Snow
Portfolio Holder(s)		N/A
<b>Consultation &amp; Community Engagement</b>		
<p>The Community Governance Review report is the outcome of a series of consultation steps undertaken over a period of more than a year.</p> <p>The response to the LGBCE proposals for County Council Divisions is part of a consultation process.</p>		
<b>Final Decision?</b>	Yes	
<b>Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)</b>		

## 1. **Summary**

- 1.1 The report brings forward the final proposals following the Community Governance Review of the District for agreement and progression in liaison with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) and also a draft submission in response to LGBCE review of Warwickshire County Council Divisions.

## 2. **Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Committee confirms its recommendations as set out at Appendix 1 and in Maps 1 to 12 and approves the Chief Executive to progress the necessary consents with the LGBCE.
- 2.2 The Committee is asked for its views on the proposal at Appendix 2 (along with Maps A & B) regarding Bishops Tachbrook/Myton and Heathcote; and Whitnash that have arisen from officer's discussion with the LGBCE and that the Chief Executive is then asked to take forward the resultant Committee's decision with the LGBCE.
- 2.3 The Committee confirms its principle view that the Local Government Boundaries should be coterminous and therefore it objects to the proposals for Warwickshire County Council Divisions and suggests and recommends that:
- (i) The LGBCE picks up the minor variation to ward and parish boundaries brought through as a result of the Community Governance Review by Warwick District Council; the University Parish Ward of Stoneleigh should be part of Kenilworth Abbey Division.
  - (ii) The LGBCE notes that the latest predicted growth for Bishops Tachbrook parish between 2014 and 2019 is 1740 electors;
  - (iii) The Commission reconsiders its proposal at Town Council level in the towns of Kenilworth, Warwick and Royal Leamington Spa to ensure co-terminosity of the Town Council wards with the District Council wards.  
and
  - (iv) the LGBCE reconsider the proposal of losing a County Councillor seat from each District/Borough area, as this is a change not made in proportion to the number of electors in each District/Borough.
- 2.4 The Committee delegates authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, to finalise the wording of the Council's representation to the LGBCE on the WCC Boundary Review.

## 3. **Reasons for the Recommendation**

### **Recommendation 2.1**

- 3.1 At its meeting of 18 September 2014 the Committee agreed a set of proposals, as a result of its Community Governance Review, for the Chief Executive to discuss informally with the LGBCE.
- 3.2 At the meeting between the Chief Executive and the LGBCE, their representative explained that two processes need to be considered. Firstly, if, as part of a Community Governance Review (CGR), Warwick District Council wishes to alter the electoral arrangements for a parish whose existing electoral arrangements were put in place within the previous five years by an order made either by the Secretary of State, the Electoral Commission, or the LGBCE,

the consent of the LGBCE is required. This includes proposals to change the names of parish wards.

- 3.3 Therefore Warwick District Council must write to the LGBCE detailing its proposal and requesting consent. The LGBCE will consider the request and will seek to ensure that the proposals do not conflict with the original recommendations of the electoral review, and that they are fair and reasonable.
- 3.4 Where a request for consent is made to the LGBCE, it will expect to receive evidence that Warwick District Council has consulted with electors in the relevant parish(es) as part of the Community Governance Review and will wish to receive details of the outcome of that review.
- 3.5 For the changes to the number or boundaries of parish wards, Warwick District Council will also need to provide the LGBCE with an existing and five-year forecast of electors in the parish(es) affected. Five-year forecasts should be accurate from the day that the review began. Both existing and forecast figures should be provided for the existing parish (and parish wards where relevant) and the proposed parish (and parish wards where relevant).
- 3.6 If the LGBCE consents to the changes it will inform Warwick District Council which will then be able to implement the proposed changes by local order. No LGBCE order would be required. Conversely, if the LGBCE declines to give consent, no local order may be made by Warwick District Council until the five-year period has expired.
- 3.7 Secondly, with regard to any proposed changes to the Warwick District Council Ward boundaries that are protected through the order due to come into force in 2015 the Council would need to take the following steps. The District Council would need to seek consent for any associated Warwick District Council and Parish boundary changes. Once this is approved the Council will need to seek approval from the LGBCE for a late alteration order to be made to ensure the District boundary is amended. This would need to be completed by early January 2015.
- 3.8 At the meeting between the Chief Executive and the LGBE there was general but informal agreement on the proposed changes. However, there was concern relating to the area of Bishop's Tachbrook.

## **Recommendation 2.2**

- 3.9 The representative from the LGBCE was concerned about the proposal in Map H and did want all the other changes to fall because of this proposal. This is because the proposed changes have been made complicated by the anticipated significant development in the Ward during the next five years. The estimated completed development of those recently granted planning applications would generate potentially 2000 new electors in the Bishop's Tachbrook ward and would; put the ward out of parity by 63%. This would be an unacceptable outcome in electoral parity terms. To try to reconcile electoral parity, officer's would suggest the changes as set out in Appendix 2 and do so knowing the outcome of the previous Committee's decision to retain the Woodside Farm area within Bishop's Tachbrook.
- 3.10 Members should understand that it is possible that "consent to vary a boundary in a protected order" of this scale would not be granted but the LGBCE may to review the District boundaries in this area earlier than five years. However, if it

is not accepted by the LGBCE then the smaller changes proposed in Appendix 1 relating to these areas should still be advocated.

## **Recommendation 2.3 to 2.4**

- 3.11 The Council has previously committed to the principal that local authority boundaries should be coterminous to provide clarity for electors. Consequently, in respect of the proposals for the County Council Divisions it is suggested that the LGBCE should be asked to amend boundaries that are agreed as part of this Community Governance Review and especially in the case of the University Ward of Stoneleigh Parish which the CGR proposes to move into Burton Green Parish and which is already part of the proposals at District level to be part of Kenilworth Abbey Ward.
- 3.12 The Committee will be mindful that the LGBCE have suggested further changes to Town Council wards within the proposals for revised Warwickshire County Council Divisions. This is believed to be because the LGBCE does not want part of a Town Ward split between County Council divisions. However, the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 states "where a Parish is to be divided between Divisions or wards, it must also be divided into Parish Wards, so that each Parish ward lies wholly within a single County division **or** District Ward." Based on this assertion the District wards should take precedent because the elections for Warwick District and Town Council's take place at the same time.
- 3.13 Officers feel it is important to delegate the wording of the final response to the Chief Executive to enable it to be amplified to include details of how the number of electors would change for each Division following the proposals suggested by Warwick District Council to both its boundaries and the County Council Divisions.
- 3.14 The proposals from the LGBCE for Warwickshire can be found at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/west-midlands/warwickshire/warwickshire-county-council> .

## **4. Policy Framework**

- 4.1 **Policy Framework** – The report does not affect the Policy Framework for the Council.
- 4.2 **Fit for the Future** – The CGR proposals will help the Council in its vision to make Warwick District a great place to live, work and visit as set out in the Sustainable Community Strategy because it will establish a better and clearer governance relationship between the growth and change in the District and communities.
- 4.3 The CGR proposals will help the Council in respect of the Service theme of FFF by clarifying the geographical extent of communities; it will help in respect of the People theme by providing clarity to staff of what community is governed by what council; it will help on the money theme as it will lead to appropriate distribution of the parish precept to the appropriate community – though to be clear this is not the purpose of the CGR.

## **5. Budgetary Framework**

- 5.1 The report does not impact on either the Budgetary Framework for the Council or the budget of this Council. However, there are potential risks associated with this which are set out within section 6 of the report.

## **6. Risks**

- 6.1 The timescales for implementing the changes are now extremely tight and are reliant on officer and member commitment to moving this forward as swiftly as possible. The failure to ensure this is completed by early January will mean the boundaries are not in place for the elections in May 2015. This will cause significant dissatisfaction in the Local Community. Therefore, this has been given priority by the Chief Executive and colleagues to ensure that it is completed in good time.
- 6.2 Members will be aware that the Committee decision in September 2014 would significantly impact on the financial viability of two Parish Councils (Cublington and Old Milverton & Blackdown Joint Parish Council). Representation has previously been received from both of these Councils about the impact a change to their boundary would have a detrimental effect on the residents who remain within the Parish if the boundaries are changed. This is because the budgets of the Councils would be so significantly reduced they would be unable to continue to provide services to the same standard. This could be considered to go against the Community Governance Review regulations and therefore there was a risk of challenge to the decision. For this reason the Council has taken its own legal advice of which Members will be advised by the time of the Committee meeting.
- 6.3 The revisions to the boundaries will impact on the production of neighbourhood plans because most Parish/Towns have applied for them to be coterminous with their Parish/Town Boundary. Any changes to boundaries could impact on proposals within Neighbourhood Plans and if the area of the Parish was increased and the Parish wanted the Neighbourhood Plan to represent the full Parish, it would be necessary for the Parish to apply for a new neighbourhood plan area to be designated and this would be subject to a further 6 week period of consultation. However, if the area of the Parish reduced in size it would not require a further round of consultation but could impact on the viability of some Neighbourhood Plans. That said, these are not material considerations which should be taken into account when determining boundaries.
- 6.4 If the Local Government Boundary Commission for England refused to accept the application for consents, the Council and the Parish/Town Councils would have to accept the original proposals from the LGBCE. This would, in the view of officers lead to boundaries which would not represent local communities and would impact on the good reputation of the Council following the work to reassure local communities on providing appropriate arrangements.
- 6.5 At present all local authorities are working towards setting their budgets for 2015/16. Due to the fact these arrangements will not be confirmed until January 2015 and the tax base needs to be agreed in November 2014. The Tax base is going to be calculated on the current arrangements which will be used for the 2015/16 budgets/precepts. The new arrangements will be put in place for 2016/17.
- 6.6 There is a requirement to undertake a Mini Canvass for the Electoral Register in early 2015, in the form of a letter being sent to each residential property in the District. The intention is to include in this letter details of the names of the

electors registered to vote at the property and the agreed changes to District Ward/ Parish/Town Council boundary changes. This may not now be possible due to timings and therefore there is a potential small cost of sending a separate letter or communication about the boundary changes.

- 6.6 Combined with these there is the risk from the proposed Warwickshire County Council Divisional boundaries. This is because the LGBCE could determine that it would be inappropriate to revise any boundaries in this area at this time and they should be considered as a complete package.

## **7. Alternative Option(s) considered**

- 7.1 The Committee could choose not to progress with the review at this stage or make changes to its previous intentions. These have been discounted because the LGBCE has accepted the principle of the changes and to step back from this now could cause more challenges. In addition to this, not to progress the changes at this stage would lead to dissatisfaction from local parties especially at Town Council level because of the need to work on the original proposed boundaries which for the Town Wards were considered unacceptable. This could also move away from the overarching principle of coterminous boundaries.
- 7.2 The Committee wish to make provision for changes to the proposals for WCC Divisional boundaries but these would need to be justified with sound reasoning especially if they moved away from a coterminous nature.

**Proposals for revised Parish/Towns and Warwick District Warding arrangements following Warwick District Community Governance Review.**

**Warwick District Community Governance Review 2013/14**

<b>ROYAL LEAMINGTON SPA</b>	
1	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Town Council ward boundaries with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England District wards of Brunswick, Clarendon, Crown, Leam, and Newbold in the town of Royal Leamington Spa. There are separate proposals (see below) which affect the proposed boundaries of Milverton, Manor and Sydenham wards.</p> <p>This is because the Town Council and Warwick District Council did not feel it was appropriate to sub divide the suggested Warwick District wards as it would not reflect the local communities that the District wards represent.</p> <p>Therefore, this would remove the proposed Town Council wards of Lime, Northumberland, Victoria Park, Brunswick South, Brunswick North, and Arlington.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries.</p>
2	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to place an order that the Town Council Wards of Royal Leamington Spa should all return two Councillors.</p>
3	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to include the land of the former North Leamington School site and the site of the new school building currently within the parish of Old Milverton into the Leamington Manor Town ward and to leave the open fields within the parish of Old Milverton. <b>(map reference 1)</b></p> <p>This proposal would affect the boundary between Milverton and Manor District wards as well as the boundary between Old Milverton Parish Council and Royal Leamington Spa Town Council and therefore a subsequent late variation consent order would need to be sought in due course.</p> <p>This would place a further 32 electors into the Leamington Manor ward and would be a minor alteration but not a significant impact on the variance of the average number of electors per Councillor, however, it would help to reduce the variance within Leamington Milverton Ward which is currently predicted to be 7% over by 2019.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is that as additional houses have now been built on the old school site and form part of the community of Leamington Manor ward, they should be represented by the same elected representatives. This proposal is supported by both the Old Milverton &amp; Blackdown Parish Council and Royal Leamington Spa Town Council.</p>

4	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Leamington Milverton Town ward with the LGBCE Milverton District ward and include the properties in Range Meadow Close, Hopton Crofts and Guy's Cliffe Avenue currently within the parish of Old Milverton in to the Leamington Milverton Town ward. <b>(map reference 2).</b></p> <p>This affects 133 residents but does not impact on the Ward arrangements for the District Council because they would remain within the same District Ward of Milverton.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries.</p> <p>It should be noted that the Old Milverton &amp; Blackdown Parish Council do not support this proposal because it believes it will impact on its financial viability. However no residents have commented on this proposal.</p>
5	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Leamington Manor Town ward with the LGBCE Manor District ward and include the New Cubbington area currently in Cubbington Parish Council North ward to be within the Leamington Manor Town ward. <b>(map reference 3).</b></p> <p>This affects circa 1221 residents. It does not impact on the Ward arrangements for the District Council because they would remain the same as the District ward.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries.</p> <p>It should be noted that Cubbington Parish Council does not support this proposal because it believes it will impact on its financial viability.</p>
6	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Leamington Sydenham Town ward with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England Sydenham District ward and include the Whitnash Town Council East ward in to the Sydenham Town ward. <b>(map reference 4)</b></p> <p>This would mean that the Whitnash East Town Council ward would become part of the Sydenham District and Leamington Sydenham Town ward. Currently there are no electors but it is anticipated there will be over 400 electors within 5 years.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries. It is the view of the District Council that due to the nature of the railway line and limited access routes to this area of land, when it is developed, the community would have a closer relationship with Royal Leamington Spa and in particular with the Sydenham area rather than with Whitnash.</p>



<b>OLD MILVERTON &amp; BLACKDOWN joint PARISH COUNCIL</b>										
7	<p>To Ward the Old Milverton and Blackdown joint Parish Council, each parish area being a separate parish ward.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Parish Area</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Ward Name</th> <th style="text-align: center;">No. of Councillors</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Old Milverton</td> <td>Old Milverton</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Blackdown</td> <td>Blackdown</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>This is required due to the two Parishes being split between two electoral Wards at District level.</p> <p>No approval from the Boundary Commission for England is required for this change, but it cannot be confirmed until the changes to the Parish boundaries have been confirmed.</p>	Parish Area	Ward Name	No. of Councillors	Old Milverton	Old Milverton	3	Blackdown	Blackdown	2
Parish Area	Ward Name	No. of Councillors								
Old Milverton	Old Milverton	3								
Blackdown	Blackdown	2								
<b>KENILWORTH TOWN COUNCIL</b>										
8	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Kenilworth St. John's Town ward with the LGBCE St. John's District ward and include the LGBCE Kenilworth Town Queen's ward in to Kenilworth St. John's Town ward and adjust the level of representation accordingly. <b>(map reference 5)</b></p> <p>This would therefore remove the need for the proposed Town Council Ward of Queen's, which, as set out, is not associated with any clear community and indeed splits some areas of established community in half i.e. Waverley Road and Station Road.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries.</p>									
9	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the south eastern boundary of Kenilworth St John's Town ward and the northern boundary of the parish of Leek Wootton and Guys Cliffe. <b>(map reference 6)</b></p> <p>The justification for this amendment is that the current boundary separates a number of houses from their gardens. The proposed boundaries follow more logical and long standing features on the ground.</p> <p>Only 12 electors are affected and the boundary change does not impact significantly on the ward arrangements for the District but would affect, marginally, the boundaries of the Arden and Kenilworth St John's District ward boundaries.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>									

10	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the northern boundary of the Kenilworth Abbey Town ward and northern boundary of the Kenilworth Park Hill Town ward and the southern boundary of parish of Burton Green. <b>(map reference 7)</b></p> <p>The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity of community leadership.</p> <p>This affects two electors and would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>
<b>BURTON GREEN PARISH COUNCIL</b>	
11	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to move the University ward from Ashow and Stoneleigh joint Parish Council to become a ward of Burton Green Parish Council. <b>(map reference 8)</b></p> <p>This enables the Parish to remain within a single Warwick District Ward. This affects 1705 electors.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Parish Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same ward boundaries.</p>
<b>WARWICK TOWN COUNCIL</b>	
12	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the Town Council ward boundaries with the Local Government Boundary Commission for England District wards of Aylesford, Emscote, Myton &amp; Heathcote, Saltisford and Woodloes in the town of Warwick. This would result in each ward being allocated 3 Councillors.</p> <p>This would remove the proposal for Town Council wards of Bridge End, Saltisford Common, Cliffe, Heathcote, St Nicholas and Woodloes Park.</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is based on co-terminosity, as the Town Council and District Council elections are held on the same day every 4 years. It will avoid confusion for the electorate and provide clarity of community leadership by having the same wards.</p>

13	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to align the northern boundary of the Warwick North Town ward (recommended Woodloes Town ward), the northern boundary of the parish of Budbrooke and the southern boundary of the parish of Leek Wootton and Guys Cliffe . <b>(map reference 9)</b></p> <p>The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity of community leadership.</p> <p>This boundary change affects 14 electors to be moved into the District Arden Ward and does not substantially alter the variance from average of either District Council Ward.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>
14	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to realign the northern boundary of the parish of Barford, the north western boundary of the parish of Bishop’s Tachbrook and the current south eastern Warwick West Town boundary (recommended Aylesford Town ward) along the M40. <b>(map reference 10)</b></p> <p>This affects the boundaries of the Ayelsford, Budbrooke and Bishop’s Tachbrook District wards but only 9 electors.</p> <p>This gives a defined boundary and places Warwick Castle Park into Warwick, just after the 1100 birthday of Warwick. The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity of community leadership.</p> <p>While the Chief Executive has approved this variation to the Parish boundary under delegated authority for the sake of clarity and consistency, consent should be gained from the LG BCE for this. It will not impact upon the Neighbourhood Plan for the Parish of Barford because it has now received approval for its designated area in line with its request for a smaller area.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>
15	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to recommend realigning the eastern boundary of the parish of Budbrooke and the current western and the current southern boundary of the Warwick West Town ward (recommended Aylesford Town ward) along the centre of the A46 and the M40. <b>(map reference 11)</b></p> <p>No electors are affected by this proposal which is included to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity community leadership.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>

<b>MYTON &amp; HEATHCOTE WARD</b>	
16	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to realign the south eastern boundary of the Warwick South Town ward (recommended ward Myton &amp; Heathcote) between the Whitnash West Town ward and the north eastern boundary of the parish of Bishop’s Tachbrook, along the centre of Heathcote Lane and Othello Avenue. <b>(map reference 12)</b></p> <p>This affects the boundaries of the Myton and Heathcote, Whitnash and Bishop’s Tachbrook District wards.</p> <p>This proposal combined with changes outlined below in (18) would see the following small changes to electors within each Ward:</p> <p>Myton Heathcote loses 197 but gains 57 meaning an overall loss of 140          Bishops Tachbrook loses 57 but gains 41 meaning an overall loss of 16          Whitnash loses 35 but gains 191 meaning an overall gain of 156</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity community leadership.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>
17	<p>To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to realign the north western boundary of the parish of Bishop’s Tachbrook and the eastern boundary of the Warwick South Town ward (recommended Myton &amp; Heathcote Town ward) along the centre of Miranda Drive from a point where the boundary meets the original boundary at Bolingbroke Drive and in a southerly direction until the original western parish boundary of Bishop’s Tachbrook is met at a point on Harbury Lane. <b>(map reference 12)</b></p> <p>This affects the boundaries of the Myton and Heathcote, Whitnash and Bishop’s Tachbrook District wards.</p> <p>This proposal combined with changes outlined above in (17) would see the following small changes to electors within each Ward:</p> <p>Myton Heathcote loses 197 and gains 57 overall loss of 140          Bishops Tachbrook loses 57 and gains 41 overall loss of 16          Whitnash loses 35 and gains 191 overall gain 156</p> <p>The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity community leadership.</p> <p>This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.</p>

## Appendix 2

### **Proposed revisions to the Warwick District Council Ward Boundary between Bishops Tachbrook and Myton/Heathcote Ward and the associated Parish Council Boundaries.**

To seek consent from the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to realign the north western boundary of the parish of Bishop's Tachbrook and southern boundary of the Warwick South Town ward (recommended Myton & Heathcote Town ward) along the centre of Harbury Lane and Europa Way. [\(map reference H\)](#)

This affects the boundaries of the Myton and Heathcote and the Bishop's Tachbrook District wards. This would impact on 134 electors at present, who would move in to the Bishops Tachbrook Ward

The justification for this proposal is to tidy up an original boundary so aiding clarity of community leadership.

This would require a subsequent application to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England for a late alteration order to amend the proposed District Council ward boundaries.

The proposal is supported by both Warwick Town Council and Bishops Tachbrook Parish Council and no comments have been received from electors on this proposal.

#### **Impact on the variance from average number of electors to Councillors ratio.**

The proposal would bring Bishops Tachbrook Ward from -12% to - 4% variance for 2014. However, the predicted electorate for 5 years is affected by the significant number of new builds in the ward of Bishops Tachbrook. Based on approved developments this could result in up to 1740 new electors in the next five years and once completed a further 2560 new electors.

Based on this, in five years Bishops Tachbrook District ward would be 63% above variance of ratio of elector to Councillor.

In addition to these figures there are two applications totalling just over 1000 properties that are due to be determined by the Planning Inspector in this ward. While the District Council is confident that it will win these appeals if they are lost this could see a further 200 electors in the ward within five years.

Based on all of this increase it would see the Bishops Tachbrook District ward being 73% above the variance of ratio of elector to Councillor.

#### **Revised Option Proposal**

In order to rectify or at least alleviate this variation officers would like the Committee to consider the following proposals (illustrated in Maps A and B):

1. To transfer the area currently within Bishop's Tachbrook Parish and District Ward north of Harbury Lane to the east and west of its junction with Tachbrook Road into Whitnash Parish and District Ward.
2. To split the Whitnash District Ward into two wards of two District Councillors – Whitnash East and Whitnash West as shown on the map at ?;

3. To arrange the Whitnash Town Wards as shown on Map, each with 8 and 7 Town Councillors, as at present.

This would have the effect of making Bishop's Tachbrook only 21% over the average elector/Councillor ratio and on average the two Whitnash wards 12% under the average.

#### Alternative options

- (1) that the Council requests again that the LGBCE review the electoral arrangements at District level within 5 years; or
- (2) that the Council proposes retaining all the properties currently in Bishops Tachbrook plus moving all the properties south of Harbury Lane on Heathcote Park then in recognition of all the additional properties in this Ward propose that a second Councillor (47<sup>th</sup> for the District). This would see the ward being variance of -16% from the average.