

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	9
Aylesbury Vale District	9
Chiltern District	11
South Bucks District	12
Wycombe District	14
Conclusions	16
Parish electoral arrangements	17
3 What happens next?	21
4 Mapping	23
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	25
B Code of practice on written consultation	28
C Table C1: Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council	30



# Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Buckinghamshire County Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

In addition, following a request from Buckinghamshire County Council, the Commission has undertaken this review with the presumption of single-member electoral divisions being recommended. The review also aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
Council Size	12 October 2010	Submission of proposals for council size to the LGBCE
One	11 January 2010	Submission of proposals of warding arrangements to the LGBCE
Two	4 April 2011	LGBCE's analysis and deliberation
Three	19 July 2011	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	11 October 2011	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Submissions received

The Commission received 21 submissions during its initial consultation on council size. During Stage One, we received 20 submissions on division patterns for the county. This included an authority-wide scheme from Buckinghamshire County Council. The Commission also received localised evidence of community identity from parish councils and local residents in the county. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and draft recommendations

### Electorate figures

Buckinghamshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2017, a date five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2012. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of just over 4% over this period. The Commission is content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time.

## Council size

Buckinghamshire County Council currently has a council size of 57 councillors. During the council size consultation the Commission received proposals for 15 different council sizes, ranging from 10 to 57 members. The County Council proposed a council size of 49, a reduction of eight. The Liberal Democrat group did not support the Council's proposal and did not submit a representation.

Having considered all the evidence, we considered that the council size should be reduced to 49 members. We consider that a council size of 49 will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively and will provide for a division pattern that best reflects community identities in Buckinghamshire.

## General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during Stage One, we have developed proposals that are based broadly on those of the County Council. We have also had regard for submissions from parish councils and some local residents. We have sought to reflect communication links, geographic factors and evidence of community identity received during Stage One.

## What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire County Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **10 October 2011**. Any received **after** this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer**  
**Buckinghamshire Review**  
**The Local Government Boundary Commission for England**  
**Layden House**  
**76–86 Turnmill Street**  
**London EC1M 5LG**  
[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Buckinghamshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority. In addition, during the early stages of this review Buckinghamshire County Council requested the Commission undertake this review with the presumption of single-member electoral divisions being recommended.

2 We wrote to Buckinghamshire County Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals first on the council size and then on division arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire County Council in early 2012.

## What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents, reflecting community identity and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Buckinghamshire?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, 30% of divisions in the county have electoral variances of over 10% from the average. Most notably, the existing Aylesbury West division has 21% more electors than the county average.

7 On 21 December 2010, Buckinghamshire County Council formally requested, under section 57 of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, that the Commission carry out a single-member division review. The Commission agreed to this request.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

8 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your division name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

9 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 10 October 2011. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in early 2012. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 21 and more information can be found on our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

10 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

11 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire County Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed division boundaries and division names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

12 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- have regard to the boundaries of district and borough wards in drawing boundaries for county divisions
- ensure that proposed county divisions do not cross external district and borough boundaries
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

13 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

14 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

15 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Buckinghamshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Buckinghamshire County Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 20 submissions during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

17 As part of this review, Buckinghamshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2017, projecting an increase in the electorate of just over 4% over the period from 2010 to 2017.

18 In developing its electorate forecasts the County Council had taken into account committed development in the county and Office of National Statistics (ONS) projected population growth. On balance, we are satisfied that the Council's estimated increase in electorate by 2017 represents the best possible estimate available at this time. We are therefore content to accept the Council's electorate figures for Buckinghamshire as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

19 Buckinghamshire County Council currently has 57 councillors elected from 47 county divisions. At the beginning of the electoral review, we consulted locally on the most appropriate number of councillors (council size) for the authority and received 22 submissions, which proposed council sizes ranging from 10 to 57.

20 The Conservative Group on Buckinghamshire County Council proposed a council size of 49 and agreed the principle that they all be elected from single-member divisions. This proposal was adopted by the County Council. We noted it did not receive cross-party support as the Liberal Democrat Group on the County Council opposed the proposal. The Liberal Democrat Group did not submit a proposal to us on council size.

21 The submission from the Conservative Group and adopted by the County Council outlined the financial savings from reducing the number of members. The proposal also indicated that the level of representation in terms of electors per councillor in their proposed 49-member scheme would be below the national average figure for English counties.

22 We also received further representations supporting a reduction in council size. One local resident proposed a reduction to between 40 and 45 members, based on the 19 Local Area Forums in the county.

23 Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council and a local resident expressed the view that each electoral division should, as far as possible, represent the same number of electors. A local resident proposed a reduction of council size down to 10 members.

24 Three parish councils, Iver, Nash and Westcott, favoured the retention of the existing council size – a 57-member council. A further eight submissions expressed

no particular view on council size, and some submissions advocated a move to a structure of unitary local government in the county.

25 On balance, we considered that there was sufficient rationale to justify reducing the council size by eight members. Furthermore, evidence received suggested that doing so would not adversely impact on the capacity of the authority to perform its statutory functions and would provide suitable representation. Accordingly, during Stage One we invited proposals for division patterns based on a council size of 49.

26 During Stage One, the Conservative Group made proposals for division arrangements for the county based on a council size of 49. We received some submissions which welcomed the proposed reduction in council size, from Nash and Stokenchurch parish councils. In light of the evidence received we are not minded to change our original conclusions on council size.

27 Accordingly, based on the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the proposed council size of 49 members as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Electoral fairness

28 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations should provide for electoral fairness whilst ensuring that we reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

29 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The county average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (381,570 in 2010 and 397,546 by 2017) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 49 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 7,787 in 2010 and 8,113 by 2017.

30 Under the draft recommendations, two of our proposed 49 divisions will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the county by 2017. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire.

## General analysis

31 We received 20 submissions during Stage One of the electoral review including an authority-wide scheme from Buckinghamshire County Council. At its meeting on 21 April 2011 the County Council endorsed the Conservative Group's proposal but with two minor amendments in the form of a name change to a division and a small boundary adjustment. The County Council proposal did not receive cross-party support as the Liberal Democrat members on the County Council did not support it. We did not receive a separate submission from the Liberal Democrat Group on division arrangements for the county.

32 The County Council proposed a pattern of 49 single-member divisions. The allocation of councillors across the districts were as follows:

- Aylesbury Vale – 17 councillors
- Chiltern – nine councillors
- South Bucks – seven councillors
- Wycombe – 16 councillors

33 The scheme proposed by the County Council for Aylesbury Vale District had 0% co-terminosity with the district wards. We also received submissions from several parish councils in the area, mainly expressing their wish to be in a division with certain other parishes. Westcott Parish Council provided evidence of links it has with neighbouring Waddesdon parish, and stated that the parish identified itself better with Waddesdon than with other neighbouring parishes.

34 In the Chiltern District the scheme proposed by the County Council provided for 22% coterminosity, with two of the nine proposed divisions being co-terminous with district wards. We also received submissions from three parish councils and a local resident.

35 Penn Parish Council argued that there should be no change to the existing arrangements, and Chesham Town Council said that the town should be represented by 'a minimum of three county councillors', due to its population.

36 In South Bucks District, the scheme proposed by the County Council had 14% co-terminosity with district wards, which equates to one of the seven divisions. We also received four other submissions: three from parish councils and one from a local resident. Denham Parish Council provided maps of proposed arrangements for councillors within the district, based on the district being allocated six, seven, or eight county councillors. Farnham Royal Parish Council wanted changes to the electoral divisions covering the parish to better reflect local community links.

37 Of the 16 divisions in Wycombe District proposed by the County Council, three were co-terminous with district ward boundaries, giving the district 19% coterminosity in total. We received three other submissions for the Wycombe district, all from parish councils. The submissions focused on maintaining existing communities.

38 Having considered the authority-wide scheme received from the County Council during Stage One, we consider that, overall, it provides for good electoral equality and strong, easily identifiable boundaries. However, based on submissions from parish councils, local residents, and our conclusions following a tour of the county, we have proposed some changes to the scheme proposed by the County Council in all four districts. We have proposed further modifications in some areas to improve electoral equality, reflect communication and transport links within divisions and to avoid creating unviable parish wards.

39 All the submissions that we received can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

40 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 30–34 and Map 1.

41 During Stage Three we welcome comments on these draft recommendations.

## Electoral arrangements

42 This section of the report details the submissions received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of Buckinghamshire. The following areas are considered in turn:

- Aylesbury Vale District (page 9)
- Chiltern District (page 11)
- South Bucks District (page 12)
- Wycombe District (page 14)

43 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 30–34 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### Aylesbury Vale District

44 Aylesbury Vale is a largely rural district, and its main towns are Aylesbury and Buckingham. It currently has 19 county councillors across 16 divisions. Three divisions are two-member divisions and the remaining 11 are single-member divisions. The district is also fully parished.

45 Under a council size of 49 members, Aylesbury Vale is allocated 17 county councillors. The County Council's scheme was loosely based on existing district wards, and allocated six councillors to Aylesbury, the main town in the district, and 11 councillors to the rest of the district.

46 The County Council proposed a Grendon Underwood division with 18% more electors than the county average by 2017. The proposed development in the Berryfields area accounts for much of the increase in electorate in this area. We understand the Berryfields development is fully contained within Quarrendon parish. In its submission the County Council noted that 'it will be up to market forces as to the scale of the extra housing in the area – bearing in mind...the current state of the economy i.e. the lack of housing demand due to the recession'. During a tour of the area we noted that the Berryfields development was underway and that necessary infrastructure was being put in place to support the development.

47 We did not wish to propose a division with such a high electoral variance from the county average. Given the close proximity of the Berryfields development to Aylesbury town we considered whether it was possible for Quarrendon parish and the entirety of the development to be included in divisions within Aylesbury town. In addition, we noted that the County Council had not included the Watermead area, which is located immediately north of Aylesbury town, in divisions within Aylesbury town but in their proposed Wing division. Again, given the close proximity of the Watermead area to Aylesbury town we also considered whether this area could be included in divisions within the town.

48 From our investigations, we determined that the inclusion of one or both of these areas would require Aylesbury town to be allocated seven councillors, of the 17 allocated to the district under a 49-member scheme. This would result in over representation for Aylesbury town and under representation for the divisions in the remainder of the district. Additionally, in order to secure reasonable levels of electoral equality across the district, it would be necessary to include, in rural divisions to the

south of the town boundary, existing communities in the northern part of Stoke Mandeville parish and which clearly form part of the Aylesbury conurbation.

49 We considered that this would arbitrarily split the existing Aylesbury town community. On balance, and in light of extensive consideration, we propose that neither Quarrendon parish nor Watermead parish are included in Aylesbury town.

50 Therefore, we have decided to adopt the County Council's proposals for Aylesbury town as part of our draft recommendations and propose a different pattern of divisions for the remainder of the district.

51 In Aylesbury town we considered that the proposed divisions provide for good levels of electoral equality – all the six divisions would have variances of less than 10% from the county average by 2017, have identifiable boundaries and do not arbitrarily split communities. The proposed divisions for the town can be seen in detail on Map 2, which accompanies this report.

52 We propose that Quarrendon parish form part of a division named Stone & Waddesdon, to the west of Aylesbury. We received a submission from Westcott Parish Council providing several examples of the links it has with the village and parish of Waddesdon, to its east. We consider that this evidence indicates that Westcott parish should be included with Waddesdon parish in this division. This proposed division would have 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

53 Our proposed Grendon Underwood division takes in a large area of the western side of the district, comprising mainly rural parishes and formed using some district wards. This proposed division would have 3% more electors than the county average by 2017.

54 Our proposed Great Brickhill division is based on the County Council's proposed division but we have amended its proposal to include two parishes, Quinton and Pitchcott. We consider that this division would have good communication links within it, and note that it provides for good electoral equality, having 6% more electors than the county average by 2017.

55 We received a submission from Nash Parish Council expressing a preference for being in a division with Winslow. Winslow Town Council stated that it would prefer to be in a division with Granborough parish, 'due to the village's proximity and affinity with the town of Winslow'. We are proposing that Nash and Granborough parishes are included in our Winslow division. We are also proposing that Thornborough parish is included in the Winslow division, rather than in Buckingham North as proposed by the County Council. We consider that the parish has good road links to neighbouring Padbury parish, and to the rest of the proposed Winslow division. This division would have 2% more electors than the county average by 2017.

56 In the north of the district the County Council proposed two divisions based around the town of Buckingham – Buckingham North and Buckingham South. We are proposing some amendments to these divisions as part of our draft recommendations.

57 Firstly, we are proposing to name our proposed divisions Buckingham North and Buckingham South-West. We consider that this name would better reflect the area the Buckingham South-West division covers. Our proposed Buckingham South-

West division includes the parish of Biddlesden, which the County Council proposed it be in the Buckingham North division. We considered that the populated area of the parish has better access to the Buckingham South-West division.

58 Our proposed Buckingham North and Buckingham South-West divisions would have 7% fewer and 7% more electors than the county average by 2017, respectively.

59 In the rural area we have proposed some different divisions from the County Council's scheme. This is due to the fact that we do not propose to adopt the County Council's Grendon Underwood division which would contain the Berryfields development and have 18% more electors than the county average by 2017.

60 During Stage One we received a submission from Bierton-with-Broughton Parish Council, noting that it would prefer to be linked with other parishes in the rural area, rather than with neighbouring Aylesbury town. The County Council proposed a division, Aston Clinton & Bierton, which would achieve this, and we have decided to adopt its proposed division as part of our draft recommendations. This proposed division would have 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

61 The remaining three divisions proposed by the County Council are Ivinghoe; Wendover, Halton & Stoke Mandeville; and Wing. We consider that these proposed divisions provide for good electoral equality and have good access throughout. Therefore we are adopting these proposed divisions as part of our draft recommendations. The divisions would have 1% more, 2% fewer, and 8% more electors than the county average by 2017, respectively.

62 Our draft recommendations in Aylesbury Vale would result in all the divisions having a projected electoral equality of no more than 10% from the county average by 2017.

## Chiltern District

63 Chiltern District is a mixture of rural parishes and small urban settlements, with the towns of Chesham and Amersham being the main areas of population. The district currently has 11 county councillors across nine divisions. Two divisions are two-member divisions; the remainder are single-member divisions.

64 Under a council size of 49 members, Chiltern District is allocated nine county councillors. The County Council proposed nine single-member divisions. Its scheme was generally based on district ward boundaries. None of the nine divisions were projected to have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the county average by 2017.

65 The County Council's proposed Chess Valley division was an unusual shape and ran from the north of the district, along the district boundary to the south of Amersham. We considered that this division would not provide effective and convenient local government because of the poor transport links within the division. Instead, we propose a division based on the parishes of Chesham, Latimer, Chenies and a part of Little Chalfont parish. We consider that this division has good access throughout, and that it provides good electoral equality. This proposed division would have 4% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

66 As a result of our proposed Chess Valley division, we are proposing a different Chesham division from that proposed by the County Council. Our proposed division is based on three district wards in Chesham town (Ridgeway, Vale and Newton) and part of another, Hilltop & Townsend. The parish of Ashley Green is also included as it has a direct transport route to Chesham via the A416 road. This proposed division would have 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

67 Our proposed Chiltern Ridges division differs from the Council's as a consequence of our draft recommendations above. This division would comprise the parishes of Cholesbury-cum-St Leonards, The Lee, Chartridge, and parts of Little Missenden, Great Missenden and Chesham parishes. The division is projected to have 1% more electors than the county average by 2017.

68 The County Council proposed a Chalfont St Peter division that would comprise four district wards – Seer Green, Gold Hill, Austenwood and Central. From our investigations and tour of the area, we noted that there was no access from Seer Green ward to the rest of the proposed division. As a consequence, we are proposing different divisions from the County Council for both Chalfont St Peter and neighbouring Chalfont St Giles.

69 Our proposed Chalfont St Peter division contains the two villages of Chalfont St Peter and Chalfont. We consider that these villages have good access between them and have clear communities of interest. Our Chalfont St Peter division would also have good electoral equality, with 8% more electors than the county average by 2017.

70 Our proposed Chalfont St Giles division is centred on Chalfont St Giles parish, which has good access to the other villages in the proposed division, Coleshill and Seer Green. In our view, this division would have good communications links and is likely to provide effective and convenient local government. Our Chalfont St Giles division would have 5% more electors than the county average by 2017.

71 We have decided to adopt the remainder of the divisions proposed by the County Council for Chiltern District. These are Great Missenden; Penn Wood & Old Amersham; Little Chalfont & Amersham Common; and Amersham & Chesham Bois. We considered these divisions achieve good levels of electoral equality and have good access throughout.

72 Our proposals for Chiltern would result in nine single-member divisions with 22% co-terminosity (two divisions) and no divisions with a projected electoral variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017.

## South Bucks District

73 South Bucks District consists of the urban areas of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, as well as some rural parishes, and some suburbs of Slough and Maidenhead, both of which are outside the county. The district currently has eight county councillors. All the divisions are single member.

74 Under a council size of 49 members, South Bucks District is allocated seven county councillors. The County Council proposed seven single-member divisions,

none of which would have a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017.

75 We note that in order to secure good levels of electoral equality, Beaconsfield parish has to be split between divisions as it has too many electors for one councillor and too few for two. The County Council considered splitting the parish so that the south-east corner of Beaconsfield would be included within its proposed Gerrards Cross division. We agree that Beaconsfield parish has to be split between divisions and that it is logical for the south-east part of Beaconsfield parish to be included with Gerrards Cross in a division. However, we propose a modification to the proposed boundary splitting Beaconsfield in order to ensure that the boundary is more easily identifiable. Our proposed boundary runs down the A355, to the A40. Our Beaconsfield division would have 3% more electors per councillor than the county average by 2017.

76 As stated above, part of Beaconsfield parish would be included in our Gerrards Cross division. We noted that the Gerrards Cross division proposed by the County Council did not have any transport routes between Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross that were wholly contained within the district. In light of this we propose a modification to the County Council's proposed Gerrards Cross division. We propose that Hedgerly parish be included in Gerrards Cross division as this provides for a transport route wholly contained within the district. Our proposed Gerrards Cross division would have 9% fewer electors per councillor by 2017.

77 The inclusion of Hedgerly parish in our Gerrards Cross division impacts on the electoral equality in our proposed Farnham Common & Burnham Beeches division. The County Council proposed two divisions in this part of the district, named Farnham Common & Burnham Beeches and Stoke Poges & Wexham. We received a submission from Farnham Royal Parish Council during Stage One. It noted that the north of the parish, Farnham Common village, had no connection to Stoke Poges and did not want to be in the same division as the town, and that Farnham Royal village, in the south of the parish, had no connection to Burnham, to its west. The Council's proposed divisions reflected the views of the parish. Under the County Council's scheme, these divisions would have 2% fewer and 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2017. However, the inclusion of Hedgerly parish in our Gerrards Cross division results in our Farnham Common & Burnham Beeches division having 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

78 In the west of the district the County Council proposed a Cliveden division which would follow the western county boundary and contain the parishes of Taplow and Dorney, as well as part of the town of Burnham. Taplow Parish Council sent a submission to us at Stage One, saying that it would like the parish kept as part of a single division. It is kept as part of a single division under our proposed Cliveden division. As part of a tour, we investigated the communications links within this division, and concluded that it would have good access throughout. Therefore, we are proposing to adopt this division as part of our draft recommendations. The division would have 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

79 We have decided to adopt the remainder of the divisions proposed by the County Council for South Bucks District. These are, Iver, Beaconsfield and Denham. We considered these divisions achieved good levels of electoral equality and have good access throughout.

80 Our proposals for South Bucks would result in seven single-member divisions with 29% co-terminosity (two divisions) and one division with a projected electoral variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017.

## Wycombe District

81 Wycombe District is a mixture of rural parishes with small villages. Its main areas of population are in the towns of High Wycombe and Marlow. Much of High Wycombe itself is unparished. The district currently has 19 county councillors across 14 divisions. Five divisions are two-member divisions and the remaining nine are single-member divisions.

82 Under a council size of 49 members, Wycombe District is allocated 16 county councillors. The County Council proposed 16 single-member divisions, generally based on district ward boundaries. None of its proposed divisions are projected to have electoral variances of greater than 10% by 2017.

83 We have proposed some different divisions from the County Council in and around High Wycombe. In some cases, the County Council's proposed divisions crossed the railway line, which splits High Wycombe north-south. We noted that the district wards in High Wycombe generally use the railway line as a dividing line between the north and south of the town. We have sought to use the railway as an easily identifiable boundary in High Wycombe where possible.

84 Our proposed Tylers Green & Loudwater division runs down the east of High Wycombe, and is bound on its east by the district boundary. It consists of the existing Tylers Green & Loudwater district ward and part of Ryemead ward. Although the railway runs through this division, there are two separate road crossings. Therefore, we believe that there are good communications links in this division. This division would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor in the county by 2017.

85 Our proposed Ryemead & Micklefield division also crosses the railway line in High Wycombe. As part of a tour of the area, we investigated the road links across the railway and considered that they are satisfactory, and would allow for good access within this division. We consider that the division would have good electoral equality, having 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

86 Our proposed Totteridge & Bowerdean division is based on the district wards of Totteridge and Bowerdean. We have modified the boundary slightly which results in the division not being wholly co-terminous with the Bowerdean district ward boundary. This amendment is in order to provide better levels of electoral equality in our Totteridge & Bowerdean and Terriers & Amersham Hill divisions. We consider that our proposed division would provide effective and convenient local government and have a reasonable level of electoral equality, having 7% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

87 For Terriers & Amersham Hill, we propose a division similar to the County Council's but with some minor amendments. These amendments are to the boundary between this division and the proposed Totteridge & Bowerdean division (as mentioned above), and we propose the railway line forms the southern boundary of this division. The division would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the

county average by 2017.

88 The County Council proposed a Booker, Cressex & Castlefield division. We noted that this division has an unusual 'bottleneck' shape to it. The proposed division combines Oakridge & Castlefield ward, and most of Booker & Cressex ward, and is bound to the south by the M40 and to the north by the railway. We investigated this unusual shape on a tour of the area, and concluded that this division does have good road links throughout. Therefore, we are proposing to adopt this division as part of our draft recommendations. This division would have 1% more electors than the county average by 2017.

89 Based on the ideal average number of electors per councillor in the county, Marlow town has too many electors for one county councillor, and too few to be allocated two. Therefore, it is necessary to split the town, and have an area of Marlow in a division with areas outside of the town. We have noted the County Council proposed that the south-eastern part of Marlow be included in a division to its east, named Flackwell Heath, Little Marlow & Marlow South-East.

90 During a tour of the area we assessed the connection between the south east part of Marlow to Little Marlow and Flackwell Heath. We considered that the A4155 road and other minor roads provide adequate transport links from the south east of Marlow to the rest of the division.

91 We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's proposed Marlow and Flackwell Heath, Little Marlow & Marlow South-East divisions but with a modification to the boundary that splits Marlow town. Our proposed boundary would run down Glade Road and along the railway line from Marlow railway station to the parish boundary at the south east corner of the town. This boundary can be seen in detail on the maps accompanying this report. Our proposed Marlow and Flackwell Heath, Little Marlow & Marlow South-East divisions would have 5% more and 8% more electors than the county average by 2017, respectively.

92 In the north of the district, the County Council proposed a series of divisions: The Risboroughs; Ridgeway East; and Ridgeway West. We are proposing slightly different divisions from those proposed by the County Council.

93 We are proposing to amend the County Council's The Risboroughs division so that it will contain all of the contiguous urban area of Monks Risborough and Princes Risborough. This would mean that all of Princes Risborough parish would be contained within one division. Consequently, we propose that the parish of Great and Little Kimble Cum Marsh be placed in the proposed Ridgeway East division rather than in The Risboroughs division. As a result of this modification, our proposed The Risboroughs and Ridgeway East divisions would have 1% more and 3% more electors than the county average by 2017, respectively.

94 We are also proposing a modification to the Ridgeway West division proposed by the Council. Our proposed Ridgeway West division would include the parish of Bradenham. We consider that including this parish would lead to the division having better transport links. Our proposed division would have a good level of electoral equality, having 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2017.

95 We are also proposing a modification to the Chiltern Villages division proposed by the Council. The County Council proposed to split Lane End parish, which would

result in the boundary of their proposed West Wycombe division running along the M40, and then through the middle of Lane End village. We consider that this would be an arbitrary boundary, unnecessarily splitting a community. We propose that the boundary follow the external parish boundary of Lane End. Our modified Chiltern Villages division would have 6% more electors than the county average by 2017.

96 Our modification to the Chiltern Villages division has an effect on the County Council’s proposed West Wycombe division. Under the County Council’s proposal the West Wycombe division would have a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2017. Not including any of Lane End parish in the West Wycombe division results in there being 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2017. Despite this variance being outside the range we would normally propose, we consider that, for the reasons noted above, the modifications proposed to the West Wycombe division should be adopted.

97 We have decided to adopt the remainder of the divisions proposed by the County Council for Wycombe District. These are The Wooburns, Bourne End & Hedsor, Hazlemere, and Downley. We considered these divisions achieved good levels of electoral equality and have good access throughout.

98 Our proposals for Wycombe would result in 16 single-member divisions with 19% co-terminosity (three divisions) and one division with a variance of more than 10% from the county average by 2017.

99 Table C1 (on pages 30–34) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Maps 1–8 accompanying the report.

## Conclusions

100 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2010 and 2017 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2010	2017
Number of councillors	49	49
Number of electoral divisions	49	49
Average number of electors per councillor	7,787	8,113
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	5	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

**Draft recommendation**

Buckinghamshire County Council should comprise 49 councillors serving 49 divisions, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

101 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

102 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, Buckinghamshire County Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

103 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Amersham, Aylesbury, Beaconsfield, Burnham, Farnham Royal, Little Chalfont, Little Missenden, Marlow and Stokenchurch.

104 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Amersham parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Amersham Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Amersham Common (returning three members), Amersham Common West (returning three members), Amersham-on-the-Hill (returning five members), Amersham Town (returning two members) and Weedon Hill (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 6.

105 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Aylesbury parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Aylesbury Town Council should comprise 24 councillors, as at present, representing 13 wards: Bedgrove North (returning two members), Bedgrove South (returning two members), Central (returning one member), Elmhurst (returning three members), Gatehouse (returning three members), Mandeville (returning three members), Oakfield North (returning one member), Oakfield South (returning one member), Oxford Road (returning two members), Quarrendon (returning two members), Southcourt (returning two members), Walton Court & Hawkslade North (returning one member) and Walton Court & Hawkslade South (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2a.

106 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Beaconsfield parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Beaconsfield Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Beaconsfield North (returning six members), Beaconsfield South (returning two members), Beaconsfield Central (returning three members) and Beaconsfield West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7.

107 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Burnham parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Burnham Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Burnham Beeches (returning three members), Burnham Church (returning five members), Burnham Church South (returning two members), Burnham Lent Rise (returning eight members) and Burnham South (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 8a.

108 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Farnham Royal parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Farnham Royal Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Farnham Royal Central (returning three members), Farnham Royal North (returning seven members), and Farnham Royal South (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Maps 8a and 8b.

109 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Little Chalfont parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Little Chalfont Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Little Chalfont (returning five members), Little Chalfont South (returning two members) and Little Chalfont North-East (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 6.

110 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Little Missenden parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Little Missenden Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Holmer Green (returning seven members), Hyde Heath (returning two members), and Little Kingshill & Little Missenden (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4.

111 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Marlow parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Marlow Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: North and West (returning seven members), South (returning two members) and South-East (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 8b.

112 As a result of our proposed electoral division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Stokenchurch parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Stokenchurch Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Stokenchurch (returning 10 members) and Beacons Bottom (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2b.



### 3 What happens next?

113 There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire County Council contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 10 October 2011. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

114 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Buckinghamshire and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed division boundaries, number of councillors and division names. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during Stage Three. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

115 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer  
Buckinghamshire Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG**

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk) or by emailing [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

116 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all Stage Three representations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of Buckinghamshire County Council and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

117 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

118 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

119 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Buckinghamshire County Council in 2013.



## 4 Mapping

### Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire

120 The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Buckinghamshire County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed division boundaries for Buckinghamshire.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Aylesbury.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Stokenchurch parish.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3a** illustrates the proposed divisions in the west of High Wycombe town.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3b** illustrates the proposed divisions in the east of High Wycombe town.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4** illustrates the proposed divisions in Little Missenden parish.
- **Sheet 5 Map 5** illustrates the proposed divisions around Chesham town.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6** illustrates the proposed divisions around Amersham town.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7** illustrates the proposed divisions around Beaconsfield town and Farnham Royal parish.
- **Sheet 8, Map 8a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Burnham and Farnham Royal parishes.
- **Sheet 8, Map 8b** illustrates the proposed divisions around Marlow town.



# Appendix A

## Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the County Council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government

	Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council, the number, names and boundaries of parish wards and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent

	them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories, a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town Council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or county council

## Appendix B

### Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Consultation* (2008)

(<http://www.bis.gov.uk/files/file47158.pdf>) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 November 2008, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

**Table B1: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England's compliance with Code criteria**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Compliance/departure</b>
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

---

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

---

We comply with this requirement.

## Appendix C

**Table C1: Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council**

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
<b>Divisions in Aylesbury Vale District</b>								
1	Aston Clinton & Berton	1	7,641	7,641	-2%	7,884	7,884	-3%
2	Aylesbury East	1	8,108	8,108	4%	8,029	8,029	-1%
3	Aylesbury North	1	8,541	8,541	10%	8,599	8,599	6%
4	Aylesbury North-West	1	8,344	8,344	7%	8,923	8,923	10%
5	Aylesbury South-East	1	8,346	8,346	7%	8,684	8,684	7%
6	Aylesbury South-West	1	7,725	7,725	-1%	7,954	7,954	-2%
7	Aylesbury West	1	8,181	8,181	5%	7,929	7,929	-2%
8	Bernwood	1	8,521	8,521	9%	8,647	8,647	7%
9	Buckingham North	1	7,044	7,044	-10%	7,574	7,574	-7%
10	Buckingham South-West	1	7,227	7,227	-7%	8,676	8,676	7%

**Table C1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
11	Great Brickhill	1	8,555	8,555	10%	8,638	8,638	6%
12	Grendon Underwood	1	8,297	8,297	7%	8,341	8,341	3%
13	Ivinghoe	1	7,802	7,802	0%	8,193	8,193	1%
14	Stone & Waddesdon	1	4,835	4,835	-38%	7,720	7,720	-5%
15	Wendover, Halton & Stoke Mandeville	1	7,774	7,774	0%	7,922	7,922	-2%
16	Wing	1	7,828	7,828	1%	8,731	8,731	8%
17	Winslow	1	7,796	7,796	0%	8,258	8,258	2%
<b>Divisions in Chiltern District</b>								
18	Amersham & Chesham Bois	1	7,569	7,569	-3%	7,744	7,744	-5%
19	Chalfont St Giles	1	8,457	8,457	9%	8,563	8,563	6%
20	Chalfont St Peter	1	8,173	8,173	9%	8,768	8,768	8%
21	Chesham	1	7,611	7,611	-2%	7,639	7,639	-6%
22	Chess Valley	1	7,533	7,533	-3%	7,782	7,782	-4%

**Table C1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2010)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2017)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Chiltern Ridges	1	8,120	8,120	4%	8,227	8,227	1%
24	Great Missenden	1	8,332	8,332	7%	8,245	8,245	2%
25	Little Chalfont & Amersham Common	1	7,403	7,403	-5%	7,807	7,807	-4%
26	Penn Wood & Old Amersham	1	8,456	8,456	9%	8,543	8,543	5%
<b>Divisions in South Bucks District</b>								
27	Beaconsfield	1	7,858	7,858	1%	8,397	8,397	3%
28	Cliveden	1	7,265	7,265	-7%	7,657	7,657	-6%
29	Denham	1	6,915	6,915	-11%	7,646	7,646	-6%
30	Farnham Common & Burnham Beeches	1	6,940	6,940	-11%	7,196	7,196	-11%
31	Gerrards Cross	1	6,824	6,824	-12%	7,367	7,367	-9%
32	Iver	1	7,807	7,807	0%	7,788	7,788	-4%
33	Stoke Poges & Wexham	1	7,664	7,664	-2%	7,849	7,849	-3%

**Table C1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
<b>Divisions in Wycombe District</b>							
34 Abbey	1	7,457	7,457	-4%	8,407	8,407	4%
35 Booker, Cressex & Castlefield	1	8,218	8,218	6%	8,170	8,170	1%
36 Chiltern Villages	1	8,625	8,625	11%	8,607	8,607	6%
37 Downley	1	7,845	7,845	1%	8,251	8,251	2%
38 Flackwell Heath, Little Marlow & Marlow South-East	1	8,548	8,548	10%	8,776	8,776	8%
39 Hazlemere	1	7,573	7,573	-3%	7,581	7,581	-7%
40 Marlow	1	8,391	8,391	8%	8,533	8,533	5%
41 Ridgeway East	1	8,371	8,371	7%	8,355	8,355	3%
42 Ridgeway West	1	7,806	7,806	0%	7,868	7,868	-3%
43 Ryemead & Micklefield	1	7,257	7,257	-7%	7,735	7,735	-5%
44 Terriers & Amersham Hill	1	7,344	7,344	-6%	7,849	7,849	-3%

**Table C1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Buckinghamshire County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2010)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2017)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
45 The Risboroughs	1	7,538	7,538	-3%	8,202	8,202	1%
46 The Wooburns, Bourne End & Hedsor	1	8,333	8,333	7%	8,329	8,329	3%
47 Totteridge & Bowerdean	1	7,666	7,666	-2%	7,584	7,584	-7%
48 Tylers Green & Loudwater	1	8,012	8,012	3%	8,120	8,120	0%
49 West Wycombe	1	7,094	7,094	-9%	7,259	7,259	-11%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>381,570</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>397,546</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,787</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,113</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Buckinghamshire County Council.

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