

 <b>Licensing &amp; Regulatory Committee</b> <b>16 April 2018</b>		<b>Agenda Item No.</b> <h1 style="text-align: center;">5</h1>
<b>Title</b>	Review of Warwick District Ward Boundaries	
<b>For further information about this report please contact</b>	Graham Leach, Democratic Services Manager & Deputy Monitoring Officer 01926 456114 <a href="mailto:graham.leach@warwickdc.gov.uk">graham.leach@warwickdc.gov.uk</a>	
<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Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006?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>	Licensing & Regulatory Committee 11 January 2018	
<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	06.04.18	Chris Elliott
Head of Service		
CMT		
Section 151 Officer	06.04.18	Mike Snow
Deputy Monitoring Officer	06.04.18	Author
Finance	06.04.18	Jenny Clayton
Portfolio Holder(s)	06.04.18	Andrew Mobbs
<b>Consultation &amp; Community Engagement</b>		
<b>Final Decision?</b>	No	
<b>Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)</b>		

## 1. **Summary**

- 1.1 The report presents the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's draft recommendations on the proposed new electoral arrangements for Warwick District Council.

## 2. **Recommendation**

- 2.1 The Committee notes the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Warwick District Council (Appendix 1 to the report).
- 2.2 The Committee asks the Chief Executive and Democratic Services Manager to discuss the proposals with Group Leaders, develop recommendations and bring forward a further report to the 29 May 2018 meeting of this Committee for consideration.
- 2.3 The Committee ask the Democratic Services Manager to ensure that the Boundary Commission for England are aware of these proposals in relationship to their review which is based on current District Ward Boundaries, especially in relation to the proposal to include the parishes of Weston Under Wetherley and Wappenbury in the Radford Semele ward.
- 2.4 The Committee asks the Democratic Services Manager to discuss the following Community Governance issues with the respective Parish/Town Councils and if necessary bring forward terms of remit (ahead of seeking approval to the LGBCE) to the 29 May 2018 meeting of this Committee:
- (1) the boundary of Whitnash and Royal Leamington Spa that runs through Champion School;
  - (2) the informal request from Kenilworth Town Council to sub divide the proposed town Wards of St John's and Park Hill; and
  - (3) the request from Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council for them to be separated into two parishes.
- 2.5 The Committee asks the Executive and Council in the August Budget Review report to consider making an additional one-off provision of £30,000 to aid the administration of the proposed changes in the run-up to the May 2019 elections.

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

- 3.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) has published the draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Warwick District Council which are attached as Appendix 1 to this report. The recommendations are open to public consultation until 11 June 2018.
- 3.2 The proposals do not wholly follow the submission made by the Council, or any single submission by other parties to the Commission for the reasons set out in the report by the LGBCE.
- 3.3 However, it should be noted that 11 of the 17 wards meet the Council's ambition for achieving coterminous boundaries by being wholly within a County division these being: Budbrooke; Bishop's Tachbrook, Cublington & Leek

Wootton; Kenilworth St Johns; Kenilworth Park Hill; Leamington Willes; Leamington North; Leamington Brunswick; Myton & Heathcote; Radford Semele; and Whitnash.

- 3.4 The Committee should be mindful of the subtle move of Shrewley Parish from the Lapworth & West Kenilworth Ward to the Budbrooke Ward. Local informal soundings suggest that this is not an issue locally, but Members need to be aware that it would result in the WCC Division of Lapworth & West Kenilworth and the WDC Ward of the same name covering slightly different electoral areas. While the elections for these two do not normally fall on the same day recent experience has suggested this is not impossible and does cause elector confusion.
- 3.5 The Committee should note that the Boundary Commission for England is reviewing the Parliamentary Boundaries and this review is unrelated. That said it is considered that the Boundary Commission for England should be made aware of this emerging proposal because of the potential for one for the new wards (Radford Semele) to be divided between two constituencies. This arises as the LGBCE proposes to include Weston under Wetherley and Wappenbury in the Radford Semele ward. However, if the Parliamentary Boundary Commission were minded including the whole of the new ward in the proposed Rugby and Southam constituency this would have had a positive effect on their last proposals (in terms of electoral equality) for both the effected parliamentary constituencies.
- 3.6 Recommendation 2.4 relates to potential Community Governance Reviews. The LGBCE have agreed a provisional timetable and indicated they would consent to these reviews being undertaken. It is unlikely they would give approval to any further reviews being undertaken after the conclusion of their Ward review and prior to the scheduled elections in May 2019. The proposed Community Governance Reviews are set out in Paragraphs 3.7 to 3.9 below.
- 3.7 As part of the review it has been identified that the boundary between Whitnash and Royal Leamington Spa runs through the Campion School site. It is therefore suggested that, subject to the agreement of the two Town Council's, an amendment should be sought so that the Boundary follows the rear of the superstore, up to the roundabout on Chesterton Drive then meets the boundary on the middle of the railway bridge, thus providing a clearly definable boundary. Only one house is affected and would move from Leamington to Whitnash.
- 3.8 As part of its submission Kenilworth Town Council has highlighted concerns regarding the potential large Town Council wards (Park Hill and St John's) as set out in para 40 of the LGBCE proposals. The responsibility to address this situation would fall to this Council through a Community Governance Review. Therefore, it is proposed that this Council reviews these boundaries and assists the Town of Kenilworth if these proposals are adopted by the LGBCE.
- 3.9 Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council has previously requested that they be separated. This request was deferred to be considered following the outcome of the Ward review by the LGBCE. It is now an appropriate time to confirm whether there is still a wish for this to happen and seek any proposals there may be for the future. The limited electorate size of Ashow is such that it could

not lawfully be formed as a Parish Council on its own. Therefore, it would need to be combined with a neighbouring Parish Council(s).

#### 4. Policy Framework

##### 4.1 Fit for the Future (FFF)

The Council's FFF Strategy is designed to deliver the Vision for the District of making it a Great Place to Live, Work and Visit. To that end amongst other things the FFF Strategy contains several Key projects.

The FFF Strategy has 3 strands – People, Services and Money and each has an external and internal element to it. The table below illustrates the impact of this proposal if any in relation to the Council's FFF Strategy.

<b>FFF Strands</b>		
<b>People</b>	<b>Services</b>	<b>Money</b>
<b>External</b>		
<b>Health, Homes, Communities</b>	<b>Green, Clean, Safe</b>	<b>Infrastructure, Enterprise, Employment</b>
<u>Intended outcomes:</u> Improved health for all Housing needs for all met Impressive cultural and sports activities Cohesive and active communities	<u>Intended outcomes:</u> Area has well looked after public spaces All communities have access to decent open space Improved air quality Low levels of crime and ASB	<u>Intended outcomes:</u> Dynamic and diverse local economy Vibrant town centres Improved performance/productivity of local economy Increased employment and income levels
<b>Impacts of Proposal</b>		
Achieving warding arrangements that reflect local communities will help assist active and cohesive communities.	None	None
<b>Internal</b>		
<b>Effective Staff</b>	<b>Maintain or Improve Services</b>	<b>Firm Financial Footing over the Longer Term</b>

<p><u>Intended outcomes:</u>  All staff are properly trained  All staff have the appropriate tools  All staff are engaged, empowered and supported  The right people are in the right job with the right skills and right behaviours</p>	<p><u>Intended outcomes:</u>  Focusing on our customers' needs  Continuously improve our processes  Increase the digital provision of services</p>	<p><u>Intended outcomes:</u>  Better return/use of our assets  Full Cost accounting  Continued cost management  Maximise income earning opportunities  Seek best value for money</p>
<p><b>Impacts of Proposal</b></p>		
<p>Use of coterminous boundaries will help to minimise pressure on staff during elections.</p>	<p>The purpose of the boundary review is to establish electoral arrangements which as far as possible avoid splitting local communities and use easily identifiable boundaries. This will help to avoid voter confusion when voting for more than one Council takes place.</p>	<p>Use of coterminous boundaries will help to minimise the cost of administering elections.</p>

4.2 **Supporting Strategies** – Not applicable.

4.3 **Changes to Existing Policies** – There are no proposed changes to existing policies.

4.4 **Impact Assessments** – Other than ensuring Voter Equality no impact assessments have been undertaken because the proposals must fit within the established national the statutory criteria.

## 5. **Budgetary Framework**

5.1 However, it is however more likely that will be a need for one off additional resources with the Electoral Services Team to implement the changes and administer the 2019 elections. This is due to the time and the specialist knowledge required for implementing the changes in a limited period. It is estimated that this would be in the region of £30,000 (including on costs).

5.2 It is recommended that a recommendation to Executive is made to incorporate this one-off £30,000 into 2019/20 in the Financial Strategy within the August Budget Review Report.

## **6. Risks**

- 6.1 With this specific report there are few risks associated with it because the main purpose of the report is to inform the Committee of the initial proposal and seek support to have further discussions with Parish/Town Council's.
- 6.2 That said as outlined in paragraph 5.2 it looks increasingly likely there will be a need for additional resources to within the Electoral Services team if coterminous boundaries were not regained. In addition, Members should aware that there is a skills/knowledge shortage in electoral administration nationally and so is hard to recruit to posts especially on a short-term contract during high demand periods (i.e. in the run up to elections), as highlighted in the recent cases in both Plymouth and Newcastle-under-Lyme. The risk therefore is that even if additional financial resources were allocated it might be difficult to find staff to fill any new post.

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

- 7.1 No alternative options were considered for the recommendations in this report because the primary purpose is for informing members and seeking support for further discussions.