

	Licensing & Regulatory Committee 29 May 2018	Agenda Item No. 9
---	---	------------------------------------

Title	Review of Warwick District Ward Boundaries
For further information about this report please contact	Graham Leach, Democratic Services Manager & Deputy Monitoring Officer 01926 456114 graham.leach@warwickdc.gov.uk
Wards of the District directly affected	All
Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006?	No
Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number	Licensing & Regulatory Committee 18 April 2018
Background Papers	

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

Officer/Councillor Approval		
Officer Approval	Date	Name
Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive	18/5/2018	Chris Elliott
Head of Service		
CMT		
Section 151 Officer		
Deputy Monitoring Officer	18/5/2018	Author
Finance		
Portfolio Holder(s)		
Consultation & Community Engagement		
Final Decision?	No	
Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)		
While this will form the final comments from Warwick District Council on the Ward Boundary Review further reports will be brought forward in due course regarding the Community Governance Reviews.		

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 and seeks confirmation of the Council's Response Submission to the Commission.

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, along with Plans 1 to 4 of the report).
- 2.2 The Committee approves the Council's Response Submission to the LGBCE, the final wording for which is delegated to the Democratic Services Manager in consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, based on the following points:
- i. the Council supports the proposed Wards for St John's, Park Hill, Cubbington & Leek Wootton, Radford Semele, Whitnash, Bishop's Tachbrook, Leamington North, Warwick Aylesford and Warwick Saltisford;
 - ii. the Council propose the Ward of Warwick Woodloes should be changed to called Warwick All Saints & Woodloes to better reflect the area it covers;
 - iii. the proposed Ward of Lapworth & West Kenilworth, should be called Arden and Kenilworth Abbey, this is to better represent the area it covers but also to avoid confusion with voters because it covers a different area to the County Division of Lapworth & West Kenilworth;
 - iv. the proposed wards in Leamington of Brunswick, Milverton, Clarendon should be provided different names to avoid confusion with voters because they cover a different area to the County Division of the same name;
 - v. that the respective Town Council are encouraged to provide names to the LGBCE for the new Town Council Wards within the Town Council areas.
- 2.3 The Committee approves the principal of the following Community Governance Reviews and that terms of reference are brought to the 6 August 2018 for approval:
- (1) the boundary of Whitnash and Royal Leamington Spa that runs through Champion School (as set out in Plan 5);
 - (2) the proposed Kenilworth Town Council Wards of St John's and Park Hill be subdivided; and
 - (3) the request from Norton Lindsey to increase the size of their Council from five to seven Councillors.

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 As explained in the report to the Committee in April 2018 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 It should be noted that 11 of the 17 wards are either coterminous with a County Division or wholly within a County division these being: Budbrooke; Bishop's Tachbrook, Cubbington & Leek Wootton; Kenilworth St Johns; Kenilworth Park Hill; Leamington Willes; Leamington North; Leamington Brunswick; Myton & Heathcote; Radford Semele; and Whitnash.
- 3.4 In April the Committee asked the Chief Executive and Democratic Services Manager to discuss the proposals with Group Leaders as set out above, develop recommendations and bring forward a further report to the 29 May 2018 meeting of this Committee for consideration. Specific consideration was requested on the following points:
1. Leamington Willes Area, as set out by the LGBCE in Para 51 and 52 of their report.
 2. The proposals for the Aylesford & Saltisford wards as per paragraph 53 to 59 of the LGBCE report
 3. The inclusion of Shrewley Parish in Lapworth & West Kenilworth Division
 4. The electorate of the town wards of Leamington to see if they are proportionate to each other (specifically College and Victoria Park Wards)
 5. Area north of River in Myton & Heathcote
 6. Electorate for the proposed town wards in Warwick, again to check if they are proportionate to the number of Councillors (specifically Wilmshurst ward)
- 3.5 Having met the proposals set out in paragraph 2.2 were agreed through consensus. However there was also mutual understanding that there was potential for further proposals to be brought to this meeting in respect of, the potential for all Leamington Wards to be coterminous with the WCC Divisions, Leamington Willes Ward and Warwick Myton & Heathcote Ward for consideration.
- 3.6 Councillors are reminded that any proposal that is brought forward should be mindful of the statutory criteria for the outcome of a review; which can be summarised as follows:
- ***Delivering electoral equality for local voters*** – this means ensuring that each councillor represents roughly the same number of voters so that the value of your vote is the same regardless of where you live in the local authority area.
 - ***Interests and identities of local communities*** – this means establishing electoral arrangements which, as far as possible, avoid splitting local ties and where boundaries are easily identifiable.
 - ***Effective and convenient local government*** – this means ensuring that the wards can be represented effectively by their elected representative(s) and that the new electoral arrangements as a whole, including both the council size decision and warding arrangements, allow the local authority to conduct its business effectively.

- 3.7 The data set used to calculate the proposed Wards from the LGBCE has been provided to all Councillors for their reference, analysis and consideration in advance of any proposals they wished to make.
- 3.8 Recommendation 2.3 relates to potential Community Governance Reviews. The proposed Community Governance Reviews are set out in Paragraphs 3.9 to 3.11 below.
- 3.9 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.
- 3.10 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 The final request from Norton Lindsey does not directly relate to the Ward Boundary Review but has been requested and the LGBCE have confirmed their consent would not be required for this review.

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.

FFF Strands		
People	Services	Money
External		
Health, Homes, Communities	Green, Clean, Safe	Infrastructure, Enterprise, Employment

<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
Impacts of Proposal		
Achieving warding arrangements that reflect local communities will help assist active and cohesive communities.	None	None
Internal		
Effective Staff	Maintain or Improve Services	Firm Financial Footing over the Longer Term
<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	<u>Intended outcomes:</u> Focusing on our customers' needs Continuously improve our processes Increase the digital provision of services	<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
Impacts of Proposal		
Use of coterminous boundaries will help to minimise pressure on staff during elections.	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.	Use of coterminous boundaries will help to minimise the cost of administering elections.

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 The report does not have a direct budgetary impact but the Committee is reminded of its support in April 2019 for additional resources within the electoral services team to implement these proposed changes.

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 5.1 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.