

# 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
Cherwell District	9
Oxford City	13
South Oxfordshire District	16
Vale of White Horse District	18
West Oxfordshire District	21
Conclusions	23
Parish electoral arrangements	24
3 What happens next?	29
4 Mapping	31
Appendices	33
A Glossary and abbreviations	33
B Code of practice on written consultation	37
C Table C1: Draft recommendations for Oxfordshire County Council	39



# Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that 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 Oxfordshire County Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in October 2010.

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 2011	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	10 October 2011	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Submissions received

The Commission received 31 submissions during its initial consultation on council size. During Stage One, we received a total of 49 submissions, including one scheme covering the whole county and a number of others covering specific districts. The district-wide schemes shared similarities in some areas and differed in others. 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

Oxfordshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2016. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in electorate of 6% over this period. The Commission is content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time.

## Council size

Oxfordshire County Council currently has a council size of 74 councillors. During the council size consultation the Commission received proposals for council sizes ranging from 50 to 74 members. The County Council proposed that the council size be reduced to 63 or 64 members, dependent on the fairest allocation of councillors between districts.

Having considered all the evidence received, we have decided to propose a council size of 63 as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that this is the most appropriate council size for Oxfordshire based on the available evidence.

## General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during Stage One, we have developed proposals which are broadly based on the County Council's county-wide scheme and representations received from other respondents. We have also had regard for evidence submitted by political groups, local MPs, county and district councillors and parish councils. 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 Oxfordshire 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 us at:

**Review Officer**  
**Oxfordshire 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 Oxfordshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to Oxfordshire County Council as well as other interested parties inviting the submission of proposals first on the council size and, subsequently, 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 Oxfordshire 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 Oxfordshire?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2009 electorate figures, Witney East electoral division contains 35% more electors than the average for the county.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the county 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.

---

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

8 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 therefore stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will accept 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 29 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?

9 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

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

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Oxfordshire 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 city 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

12 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 our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

13 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.

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Oxfordshire 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

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Oxfordshire County Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 31 submissions at council size stage and 49 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

16 As part of this review, Oxfordshire County Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2016, projecting an increase in electorate of just over 6% over the period from 2011 to 2016. The total electorate of the county is 492,669 in 2011 and is forecast to be 524,196 by December 2016.

17 Cherwell District was forecast to have significant electorate growth owing to the projected completion of new dwellings in the Banbury and Bicester areas. We have sought confirmation of planning permission for development in these and other areas of the county and visited some areas where building works are evident. The County Council provided us with details of the location and level of future development, as well as estimates of other forms of electorate growth. We are satisfied that the methodology used was suitable and so are content to accept these forecast electorate figures as the basis for our draft recommendations.

## Council size

18 Oxfordshire County Council currently has 74 councillors elected from 58 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 31 submissions. Council size proposals ranged from 50 to 74 members, with 11 submissions supporting the current council size of 74 and nine submissions suggesting that “fewer” councillors would be appropriate for Oxfordshire.

19 The County Council proposed reducing the council size to 63 or 64, depending upon the number of councillors which could be most fairly divided between the five district areas of the county. At this time the electorate figures suggested that a council size of 64 would provide for a fairer allocation of councillors to the district areas.

20 To support this reduction in council size the County Council cited evidence relating to the existing political management structure and the workloads of members. In the absence of any robust evidence for an alternative council size, and subject to achieving satisfactory levels of electoral equality, we considered that the council size should be reduced. Accordingly, during Stage One we invited proposals for division patterns based on a council size of 64.

21 During Stage One, the County Council submitted slightly revised figures for the projected electorate. These amendments were based on small changes to the

planned developments in the county, and had the knock-on effect that a council size of 63 now provided for a fairer allocation of county councillors to the district areas. Based on the evidence received, we have decided to adopt the proposed council size of 63 members as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Electoral fairness

22 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.

23 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The county average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (492,669 in 2011 and 524,196 by December 2016) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 63 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 7,820 in 2011 and 8,321 by 2016.

24 Under the draft recommendations, two of our proposed 63 divisions will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the county by 2016. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness under our draft recommendations for Oxfordshire.

## General analysis

25 We received 49 submissions during Stage One. This included the County Council's scheme covering the whole county, and a number of district-wide schemes.

26 The County Council proposal and all the district-wide proposals allocated councillors across the districts as follows:

- Cherwell District – 14 members
- Oxford City – 14 members
- South Oxfordshire District – 13 members
- Vale of White Horse District – 12 members
- West Oxfordshire District – 10 members

27 Our draft recommendations are also based on the allocation of these numbers of councillors to districts.

28 In some areas of the county the County Council proposed two different options. In Banbury the County Council proposed two separate patterns for the town. In Thame and the centre of South Oxfordshire the County Council also proposed two different patterns. For the whole of Oxford City, the County Council proposed two different schemes, one of which was supported by the Oxfordshire County Labour Party and Oxfordshire City Council, while the other scheme was very similar to the Liberal Democrat Group on the City Council. Where the County Council have

submitted two schemes, we have taken care to examine both in reaching conclusions on our draft recommendations.

29 The County Council's proposals were for a pattern of predominantly single-member divisions. In Vale of White Horse District it proposed a two-member Grove & Wantage division, and included options for two-member divisions in Banbury (Cherwell District) and Thame (South Oxfordshire District). All other divisions proposed by the County Council were single-member divisions.

30 We received district-wide schemes for Cherwell from the Oxfordshire County Labour Party and the Oxfordshire Labour Group. We received district-wide schemes for Oxford City from Oxford City Council, the Oxfordshire Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group on Oxford City Council, and a local resident. In South Oxfordshire we received no district-wide schemes. We received a district-wide scheme in Vale of White Horse from a local resident. In West Oxfordshire the County Council's scheme was supported by West Oxfordshire District Council and the West Oxfordshire Conservative Association.

31 We also received localised submissions in every district. Many of these submissions focused on a particular parish or small group of parishes, or on a particular part of a town. The majority of these representations were from parish councils, with local residents also submitting their views.

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

33 We have based our draft recommendations broadly on a combination of the County Council's proposals, the Labour Group's proposals, and locally suggested patterns. We have adopted with minor modifications the County Council's proposals in South Oxfordshire and West Oxfordshire, the County Council Proposal A in Oxford, and a combination of locally generated proposals, Labour Group proposals, as well as the County Council's scheme in Cherwell and Vale of White Horse.

34 Where we have proposed further modifications, these are to improve electoral equality, reflect communication and transport links within divisions and to avoid creating unviable parish wards. During Stage Three we welcome comments on these draft recommendations.

35 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table C1 (on pages 39–44) and Map 1.

## Electoral arrangements

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

- Cherwell District (page 9)
- Oxford City (page 13)
- South Oxfordshire District (page 16)
- Vale of White Horse District (page 18)
- West Oxfordshire District (page 21)

37 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 39–44 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### Cherwell District

38 Cherwell lies to the north of the county. It comprises the towns of Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington and some neighbouring smaller towns and villages. Cherwell currently has 16 councillors representing 13 electoral divisions. The district is entitled to 14 members under a 63-member scheme for Oxfordshire County Council.

39 The County Council proposed a single-member scheme for the majority of the district. In Banbury the Council submitted two separate schemes, referred to as Proposal A and Proposal B. The County Council's Proposal A recommended single-member divisions and Proposal B recommended a two-member division.

40 We received district-wide submissions from the Oxfordshire County Labour Party and the Oxfordshire Labour Group. These two submissions were identical to each other, and differed significantly from the County Council proposals. We also received submissions from Banbury Town Council, Begbroke Parish Council, Bletchington Parish Council, Bodicote Parish Council, Caversfield Parish Council, Kidlington Parish Council, Middleton Stoney Parish Council, Mollington Parish Council and Sibford Gower Parish Council.

41 In the north west of Cherwell, the County Council proposed a single-member Wroxton & Hook Norton division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016. The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposed an identical division. This division was supported by Mollington Parish Council.

42 In the absence of other suggestions, and as this pattern provides for good electoral equality, we have decided to adopt the County Council's proposal for a single-member Wroxton & Hook Norton division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016.

43 In Banbury, the County Council submitted two different proposals. Proposal A provided for a single-member Banbury Grimsbury & Castle division with a variance of 10% fewer electors; a single-member Banbury Hardwick division with a variance of 8% fewer electors; a single-member Banbury Neithrop division with a variance of

12% fewer electors; a single-member Banbury Ruscote division with a variance of 21% fewer electors; and a single-member Banbury Easington division with a variance of 6% more electors than the county average by 2016.

44 We do not consider that the County Council's Proposal A provides for good electoral equality, as it results in a division with 21% fewer electors than the average. We have not received any community evidence to support this particular pattern within the town of Banbury.

45 The second proposal from the County Council, Proposal B, provided for a single-member Banbury Grimsbury & Castle division with a variance of 10% fewer electors; a single-member Banbury Hardwick division with a variance of 6% more electors; a single-member Banbury Ruscote & Neithrop division with a variance of 5% more electors; and a two-member Banbury Easington & Bodicote division with a variance of 13% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

46 Proposal B would include the parish of Bodicote in the two-member Banbury Easington division. The Bankside development falls on the parish boundary between Bodicote and Banbury. As this development is divided between the two parishes, we recommend that Bodicote is warded in anticipation of the future boundaries of the development. By 2016 approximately 1,600 new electors are expected in Bodicote parish, with another 1,000 electors in Banbury town as a result of this development. Both the County Council and Cherwell District Council have confirmed that these houses are scheduled to be completed by 2016, and that work is due to start at the end of summer 2011.

47 Bodicote Parish Council submitted that it did not wish to be included in a division with Banbury as it wished to retain its rural identity. Banbury Town Council stated that it supports both proposals from the County Council and that the new Bankside development is considered to be part of Banbury.

48 The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals provided for three divisions identical to the County Council's Proposal B: Banbury Grimsbury & Castle; Banbury Hardwick; and Banbury Ruscote. These divisions provided for acceptable electoral equality. The Labour proposals also provided for a single-member Banbury Calthorpe division with a variance of 2% fewer electors and a single-member Bloxham & Easington division with a variance of 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

49 We note that in order to obtain good levels of electoral equality, it is necessary to include either Bloxham or Bodicote with parts of Banbury. However, it is not possible to include both parishes in the Banbury divisions, as this would have a knock-on effect of very poor electoral equality in the southern section of Cherwell. The geography of the area means that these are the only two parishes which can be considered for inclusion in a Banbury division.

50 Although Bodicote is the nearest parish, the inclusion of Bloxham, as suggested by the Labour proposals, provides for better electoral equality overall. The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals also argued that Bloxham has better connections with Banbury than with the rural parishes to the south east, and that

there is more similarity between the Easington area of Banbury and Bloxham than between the Calthorpe area of Banbury and Bodicote. We therefore recommend that Bloxham, and not Bodicote, is combined in a division with part of Banbury.

51 We have decided to adopt the proposals from the County Council, Labour Party and the Labour Group for a single-member Banbury Hardwick division with a variance of 6% more electors and a single-member Banbury Ruscote division with a variance of 5% more electors. These divisions provide for good electoral equality and have strong, clearly identifiable boundaries. In the Banbury Grimsbury and Castle division we recommend a minor amendment in order to include the majority of the town centre in one division and to provide for a clear boundary. Our recommendation is therefore for a single-member Banbury Grimsbury & Castle division with a variance of 9% fewer electors by 2016.

52 In the Banbury area we also recommend a single-member Banbury Calthorpe division with a variance of 3% fewer electors and a single-member Bloxham & Easington division with a variance of 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. These divisions are based on the Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals.

53 In Bicester, the County Council proposed three single-member divisions which include the development sites on the outskirts, but do not mix rural and urban areas. The County Council proposed a single-member Bicester North & Town division with a variance of 2% more electors; a single-member Bicester South & East division with a variance of 4% more electors; and a single-member Bicester West division with a variance of 14% more electors than the county average by 2016.

54 The Bicester West division would include the new development to the south west of Bicester, part of which lies in the parish of Chesterton. As part of this development site is in the parish of Chesterton, we recommend that Chesterton is warded in anticipation of the future boundaries of the development. Approximately 1,000 electors are expected to have moved into these residences by 2016.

55 The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals suggested a similar Bicester West division, with a slightly different eastern boundary, and a variance of 3% more electors than the county average in 2016. They suggested a Bicester Town division containing the centre and part of the north of Bicester, with a variance of 7% more electors than the county average in 2016. The remaining part of the north of Bicester would be part of a combined rural and urban Bicester North East division with a variance of 9% fewer electors, while the southern section of Bicester would be part of a Bicester South & Otmoor division with a variance of 1% more electors than the county average in 2016. The south eastern section of Bicester is divided from the rest of the town by a railway line, which we consider to be a strong and obvious boundary.

56 We consider that the County Council's proposals in Bicester do not reflect either clear boundaries or community identity within the urban area. The County Council's proposed Bicester South & East division combines two areas of the town which are separated by a railway line and an industrial estate. The boundaries of the proposed Bicester North & Town division cross one another in the centre of the urban area,

forming two separate parts. We do not consider that the County Council's proposals provide for convenient and effective local boundaries, or are supported by community evidence.

57 We have based our recommendations on the Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals. We have decided to adopt as our recommendation the Labour proposals for a single-member Bicester West division with a variance of 2% more electors, and adopt a modified proposal for a single-member Bicester Town division with a variance of 6% fewer electors than the county average in 2016. We have also decided to adopt a slightly modified version of Labour's proposed Bicester South & Otmoor division, which we have named Otmoor division, with a variance of 3% fewer electors than the county average in 2016.

58 To the north of Bicester there are plans for an eco town of 5,000 homes, of which 500 are expected to be completed by 2016. However, planning permission has not yet been granted and we therefore considered a number of options for this area. The eco town site covers part of the parishes of Caversfield and Bucknell. Caversfield Parish Council forwarded a submission saying that it was a community distinct from Bicester and did not wish to be subsumed into Bicester Town. However, based on the location of the proposed eco town and electoral equality, we consider that Caversfield and Bucknell would be best served by being included within the Bicester Town division. We therefore recommend a single-member Bicester North division with a variance of 8% fewer electors than the county average in 2016.

59 To the north of Bicester, the County Council recommended a single-member Ploughley division with a variance of 8% fewer electors. The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals recommended a Heyfords division with a variance of 8% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. We considered the transport links in this area, which arch around Bicester as well as passing through the town, and we recommend a single-member Ploughley division with a variance of 7% fewer electors than the county average in 2016. This division is similar to the County Council proposal, and contains rural parishes connected by good road links.

60 In the Deddington area the County Council proposed a single-member Deddington division with a variance of 8% more electors than the average in 2016. The Labour Party and the Labour Group proposals were for a similar single-member Deddington division with a variance of 2% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. We recognise that Deddington is the focus of this area, which is in the middle of Cherwell, and propose a single-member division with a variance of 3% fewer electors than the county average in 2016. Our division is similar to the County Council and Labour proposals, and facilitates a good pattern of divisions in the rest of the district.

61 In the Kidlington area, the County Council proposed a single-member Kidlington division with a variance of 6% fewer electors. The County Council's proposal combined the Begbroke, Yarnton and Gosford & Water Eton parishes with the district ward of Otmoor in the east, while the parishes north of Kidlington were included in a Ploughley division to the north. The Labour proposals were for a similar but not identical single-member Kidlington division with a variance of 5% fewer electors.

62 Kidlington Parish Council recommended a single-member Kidlington division with a variance of 6% fewer electors and a single-member un-named rural division with a variance of 2% more electors than the average by 2016. The Kidlington division was identical to that proposed by the County Council. Kidlington Parish Council expressed its opposition to multi-member divisions, stating that in rural and semi-rural areas the divisions were too large to be run effectively. Bletchington Parish Council asked that the nearby parishes, including Kirtlington to the north of Kidlington, be included in the Kidlington area instead of becoming part of a Ploughley division.

63 In the rural area around Kidlington, we considered that both the County Council and the Labour proposals created divisions which contained few road links between the composite parishes. In particular, we note that there is no road link between the parish of Gosford & Water Eton to the south of Kidlington and the parish of Islip in the Otmoor area.

64 While the division of Kidlington town proposed by Kidlington Parish Council and the County Council provided clear boundaries, it results in the centre of town being combined with rural areas and in the parishes to the south of Kidlington awkwardly combined with those to the north of the town. We therefore recommend an amended form of the proposal from Kidlington Parish Council. This would result in a single-member Kidlington division with a variance of 8% fewer electors and a single-member rural Kirtlington division with a variance of 4% more electors than the average by 2016.

65 Overall, we recommend a pattern of divisions based on a combination of the Labour proposals, the County Council scheme and the submission from Kidlington Parish Council. None of these divisions are more than 10% from the average for the county in 2016, although due to ongoing development three of these divisions currently provide for poor electoral equality.

66 Table C1 (on pages 39–44) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## Oxford City

67 Oxford City lies in the centre of the county, and contains four parishes. Currently, Oxford City is divided into eight electoral divisions returning 16 councillors. Oxford is entitled to 14 members under a 63-member scheme for Oxfordshire County Council.

68 The County Council provided two separate schemes for the district, referred to as Proposal A and Proposal B. We also received district-wide submissions from Oxford City Council, the Oxfordshire County Labour Party, the Liberal Democrat Group on Oxford City Council, and a local resident. Localised submissions were received from Old Marston Parish Council and Councillor Fooks (Summertown & Wolvercote).

69 The County Council's Proposal A was identical to the Labour submission and the City Council submission. Proposal B was very similar to the Liberal Democrat submission, differing only in two small areas. A different district-wide submission was received from a local resident. All of these district-wide submissions used similar boundaries and created similar divisions.

70 In the north and west of Oxford City the County Council's Proposal A was for a single-member Wolvercote & Summertown division with a variance of 1% more electors; a single-member Jericho & Osney division with a variance of 2% more electors; a single-member St Margaret's division with a variance of 1% more electors; a single-member Marston & Northway division with a variance of 1% fewer electors; and a single-member University Parks division with a variance of 4% more electors than the county average by 2016. The Labour Party and Oxford City Council supported the County Council's Proposal A, and argued that this pattern used clear natural boundaries.

71 The County Council's Proposal B was for a single-member Wolvercote & Summertown West division with a variance of 10% fewer electors; a single-member Jericho & North division with a variance of 13% fewer electors; a single-member St Margaret's & Summertown East division with a variance of 9% fewer electors; a single-member Marston, Headington Hill & Northway division with a variance of 4% more electors; and a single-member Holywell & Carfax North division with a variance of 4% more electors than the county average by 2016.

72 The local resident proposed a single-member Wolvercote & Cutteslowe division with a variance of 1% more electors; a single-member North Oxford division with a variance of less than 1% more electors; a single-member West Oxford division with a variance of 2% more electors; a single-member Marston division with a variance of 3% fewer electors; and a single-member Centre division with a variance of 1% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

73 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed a pattern similar to the County Council's Proposal B in this area. It differed in the Jericho and central areas, providing for a Holywell & Carfax North division with a variance of 1% more electors and a Jericho & North division with a variance of 5% fewer electors by 2016.

74 Councillor Fooks suggested that the County Council's Proposal B better represented communities in the north of Oxford, but he provided little evidence. Old Marston Parish Council requested that the parish be increased in size to include Marston Road, Marsh Drive and Cherwell Lane.

75 In the north and west of Oxford City, Proposal A provided for good electoral equality, with all divisions having a variance of less than 5% from the average electorate for the county by 2016. Proposal B provides for poorer electoral equality than Proposal A, with the Jericho & North division containing 13% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

76 The Liberal Democrat Group argued that their proposal provided for better links between communities. However, we considered that in parts of the city this was at the expense of clear, easily identifiable boundaries. In particular, the Liberal

Democrat Group argued that there are few community links between Jericho and the areas of Osney and Botley Road, which are separated from each other by a railway line. However, the location of Osney and Botley Road between the railway to the east and the district boundary to the west means that these areas have no transport links to any other parts of Oxford City. Due to the small number of electors in Osney and Botley Road, it is necessary for them to be combined with part of the rest of Oxford City in a division.

77 On balance, we consider that the County Council's Proposal A provided for better electoral equality than Proposal B and appeared to be based on clearer geographical boundaries than the scheme from the local resident in this part of the city. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's Proposal A without modification as our draft recommendations.

78 In the east of Oxford City, the County Council's Proposal A was for a single-member Barton, Sandhills & Risinghurst division with a variance of less than 1% more electors; a single-member Headington & Quarry division with a variance of 1% more electors; and a single-member Churchill & Lye Valley division with a variance of 3% more electors than the county average by 2016. The Labour Party and Oxford City Council supported the County Council's Proposal A, and argued that this pattern combined areas with similar focus points and community links.

79 In the east of Oxford City, the County Council's Proposal B was for a single-member Barton, Sandhills & Risinghurst division with a variance of 4% fewer electors; a single-member Headington & Quarry division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; and a single-member Churchill & Lye Valley division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed a pattern identical to the County Council's Proposal B in this area.

80 We considered that the County Council's Proposal A provided for clearer boundaries and combined areas of common interest. Also, using Proposal A in this area facilitated a better pattern of divisions across Oxford City.

81 In the south of Oxford City, the County Council's Proposal A was for a single-member Isis division with a variance of 1% more electors; a single-member St Clement's & Cowley Marsh division with a variance of 4% fewer electors; a single-member Iffley Fields & St Mary's division with a variance of 3% fewer electors; a single-member Rose Hill & Littlemore division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; a single-member Cowley division with a variance of 1% fewer electors; a single-member Leys division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016. The Labour Party and Oxford City Council supported the County Council's proposal A, and argued that this pattern provided for clear boundaries and combined similar communities.

82 The County Council's Proposal B was for a single-member Hinksey Park, Osney & Carfax South division with a variance of 9% more electors; a single-member St Clement's & Cowley Marsh division with a variance of 7% more electors; a single-member St Mary's & Iffley Fields division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; a single-member Littlemore & Rose Hill division with a variance of 4% more electors; a single-member Cowley & Iffley division with a variance of 10% more electors; and a

single-member Leys division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016.

83 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed a pattern similar to the County Council's Proposal B in this area. It differed in the south west, providing for a Cowley & Iffley division with a variance of 8% more electors and a Littlemore & Rose Hill division with a variance of 9% more electors by 2016. The Liberal Democrats argued that their pattern provided for better community cohesion and did not combine areas which had few community links, particularly with regard to the Rose Hill and Iffley Village areas.

84 The local resident proposed a single-member East Oxford division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; a single-member Cowley division with a variance of 3% fewer electors; a single-member South Oxford division with a variance of 5% more electors; a single-member Rose Hill & Littlemore division with a variance of 2% more electors; a single-member Boundary Brook division with a variance of 1% more electors; and a single-member Leys division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016.

85 We noted that Proposal A, Proposal B and the local resident's scheme all used similar boundaries in some areas, but only one division (Leys division) was the same across all patterns. We consider that the County Council's Proposal A provides good electoral equality and appears to be based on clear geographical boundaries. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's Proposal A without modification as our draft recommendations.

86 Overall, we consider that the County Council's Proposal A provides for good electoral equality, with no division with a variance more than 4% from the average electorate for the county by 2016. We have decided to adopt the County Council's Proposal A as our draft recommendations.

87 Table C1 (on pages 39–44) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## South Oxfordshire District

88 South Oxfordshire is in the south east of the county, and contains the towns of Thame, Wallingford, Didcot and Henley-on-Thames. Currently South Oxfordshire is divided into 14 electoral divisions and returns 16 councillors. The district is entitled to 13 members under a 63-member scheme for Oxfordshire County Council.

89 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received submissions from Baldons Parish Council, Benson Parish Council, Didcot Town Council, Eye & Dunsden Parish Council, Henley-on-Thames Town Council, North Moreton Parish Council, Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council, Thame Town Council, Wallingford Town Council, Wheatley Parish Council, Councillor Atkins (Wallingford), and a local resident.

90 In the Didcot area, the County Council proposed a single-member Didcot East & Hagbourne division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; a single-member Didcot

Ladygrove division with a variance of 12% fewer electors; and a single-member Didcot West division with a variance of 5% more electors than the county average by 2016. Didcot Town Council emphasised the importance of the development of the Ladygrove and Western areas, which are to the west and north of the town.

91 The Didcot East & Hagbourne division contains the south eastern part of Didcot town and the nearby rural Moreton, Aston and Hagbourne areas. This combination of rural and urban areas is unavoidable, as Didcot town is too large for two councillors (even without the forecast growth on the Western and Ladygrove development sites) and too small for three councillors. North Moreton Parish Council requested that it be placed in the same division as South Moreton due to natural ties with the latter and shared facilities such as schools. It requested not to be combined with any area of Didcot or Wallingford as it considers the parish to be a rural community. However, as both North Moreton and South Moreton are located close to the district boundary and directly between the towns of Didcot and Wallingford, it is necessary for them and other rural parishes to be in a division with either part of Didcot or with the whole of Wallingford. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's division pattern in this area, which combines North Moreton with South Morton, four other rural parishes and part of Didcot.

92 In the centre of the district, the County Council proposed two separate patterns, both of which provided for two rural divisions. The first was a single-member Watlington & Berinsfield division with a variance of 10% more and a single-member Chalgrove division with a variance of 2% fewer electors than the average by 2016. The second was a single-member Chalgrove & Watlington division with a variance of 7% more and a single-member Berinsfield & Garsington division with a variance of 1% more electors than the average by 2016. On balance, we consider that the second proposal provides for slightly better electoral equality, clearer boundaries, and better transport links between constituent parishes. Furthermore, the submissions from Baldons Parish Council and Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council provided good evidence of community links for the second proposal. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's second proposed pattern in this area.

93 In the north of the district the County Council proposed a single-member Wheatley division with a variance of 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. Wheatley Parish Council mentioned links with the neighbouring villages of Holton, Forest Hill, Cuddesdon and Garsington. We note that the first three of these parishes are contained within the County Council's proposed Wheatley division. Including Garsington parish in Wheatley division would result in knock-on effects to the County Council's proposed Berinsfield & Garsington division, which was supported by Baldons Parish Council and Nuneham Courtenay Parish Council. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's division pattern in this area.

94 In the Thame area, the County Council proposed two separate patterns. The first was a two-member Thame & Chinnor division, coterminous with the district wards, with a variance of 1% fewer electors than the average by 2016. The second was a single-member Thame North & East division with a variance of 13% fewer and a single-member Chinnor & Thame West division with a variance of 10% more electors than the average by 2016. Thame Town Council opposed dividing the town,

arguing that a division which combined a small part of the town with the rural area would not provide good representation.

95 We considered a number of possibilities for dividing the town of Thame, but concluded that the area which appears most distinct from the centre of the town is on the west side, with very poor road links to the rural parishes which lie to the south east of Thame. We received no submissions suggesting that a different part of the town be combined with the rural area. In the absence of other suggestions on how to divide the town of Thame, we recommend the Council's two-member division.

96 In the Wallingford area, the County Council proposed a single-member Wallingford division with a variance of 4% fewer electors and a single-member Benson division with a variance of 2% more electors than the county average by 2016. Wallingford Parish Council and Councillor Atkins (Wallingford Division) argued that the area to the south of Wallingford, called Winterbrook, should be included in the Wallingford division as it is part of the Wallingford community. However, we consider that we have received insufficient evidence to deviate from the existing parish boundaries, as including Winterbrook with Wallingford would divide the parish of Cholsey. We also note that the submissions pointed towards a change in the parish boundaries, a responsibility which lies with South Oxfordshire District Council, and that no submission made clear where the boundary between Winterbrook and Cholsey should be drawn. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's division pattern in this area, but would welcome submissions from Winterbrook providing evidence to support or oppose our recommendation.

97 In the south east the County Council proposed a single-member Henley-on-Thames division with a variance of 8% more electors; a single-member Goring division with a variance of 3% more electors; and a single-member Sonning Common division with a variance of 7% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. The submissions received in this area broadly supported the County Council's proposals. We therefore adopt the County Council's division pattern in this area.

98 Overall, we adopt the County Council's proposals as our draft recommendations. In Thame we adopt the County Council's alternative two-member division, while in the centre of South Oxfordshire we adopt the County Council's Chalgrove & Watlington and Berinsfield & Garsington divisions.

99 Table C1 (on pages 39–44) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## Vale of White Horse District

100 Vale of White Horse lies in the south west of the county. The largest town is Abingdon, and the district also contains the large villages of Radley, Wantage, Sutton Courtenay and North Hinksey. Currently, Vale of White Horse is divided into 12 electoral divisions, returning 14 councillors. The district is entitled to 12 members under a 63-member scheme for Oxfordshire County Council.

101 As well as the county-wide scheme, we received a district-wide submission from a local resident (who was formerly a county councillor), which was identical to the

County Council's scheme apart from in the Cumnor, North Hinksey and Radley area. Submissions were also received from Abingdon Town Council, Appleton with Eaton Parish Council, Cumnor Parish Council, Drayton Parish Council, Milton Parish Council, Marcham Parish Council, North Hinksey Parish Council, Radley Parish Council, Sutton Courtenay Parish Council, and two local residents.

102 In Abingdon town, the County Council proposed a single-member Abingdon East division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; a single-member Abingdon North division with a variance of 10% more electors; and a single-member Abingdon South division with a variance of 3% more electors than the county average by 2016. Abingdon Town Council and a local resident supported the County Council's proposal not to combine areas of the town with the neighbouring rural parishes, although Drayton Parish Council (to the south of Abingdon) asserted that it had community connections with South Abingdon.

103 We consider that the County Council's proposed Abingdon East division provides for good electoral equality and follows clear boundaries. We therefore adopt the County Council's Abingdon East division as part of our draft recommendations.

104 In the centre of Abingdon we consider that electoral equality can be improved with a transfer of approximately 500 electors between Abingdon North and Abingdon South divisions. This transfer would also provide for a clear boundary. Our recommended Abingdon North division would therefore have a variance of 7% more electors and our recommended single-member Abingdon South division a variance of 6% more electors than the county average by 2016.

105 In the western part of the district the County Council proposed a single-member Faringdon division with a variance of 5% fewer electors and a single-member Shrivenham division with a variance of 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these areas. We consider that these divisions have clear boundaries and have therefore decided to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations.

106 In Grove and Wantage, the County Council proposed to maintain its two-member Grove & Wantage division, stating that this division continues to work well. It would have a variance of 5% more electors than the average by 2016. No submissions specifically relating to this area were received. We note that dividing this into two single-member divisions would necessitate a small section of Wantage being placed in the Grove division to provide good electoral equality. In light of the lack of evidence in support of single-member divisions in this area, we have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's proposed two-member division.

107 In the south eastern part of the district the County Council proposed a single-member Marcham & Hendreds division with a variance of 8% fewer electors and a single-member Sutton Courtenay & Harwell division with a variance of less than 1% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. Milton Parish Council objected to the County Council's proposals, on the grounds that they would result in Milton parish being divided between the two divisions. However, Milton parish is currently divided between two district wards, with the boundary running along a dual carriageway and a large roundabout. Drayton Parish Council asserted that it had links to Sutton Courtenay, Abingdon and Steventon but not to the Hendreds or to Marcham. No

detailed evidence was provided. Marcham Parish Council stated that it had common interests with the neighbouring parish of St Helen Without.

108 We examined a number of options in this area, and noted that an alternative pattern would produce a northern division containing Drayton, Marcham, Milton and Sutton Courtenay, and a southern division containing Harwell, the Hendreds and Steventon. This alternative pattern would keep Drayton with Sutton Courtenay and would not divide Milton. The electoral variances would be similar to the County Council's proposal, with a single-member Hendreds & Harwell division with a variance of less than 1% fewer electors and a single-member Sutton Courtenay & Marcham division with a variance of 8% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. We consider that this alternative pattern provides for good links between parishes, particularly between Sutton Courtenay, Milton and Drayton. We have therefore decided to recommend our alternative pattern of a single-member Hendreds & Harwell division with a variance of less than 1% fewer electors and a single-member Sutton Courtenay & Marcham division with a variance of 8% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

109 In the northern and western part of the district the County Council proposed a single-member Kennington & Radley division with a variance of 6% more electors; a single-member Kingston Bagpuize division with a variance of 1% fewer electors; and a single-member North Hinksey & Cumnor division with a variance of 14% more electors than the county average by 2016. Alternative proposals were provided by a local resident, North Hinksey Parish Council and Cumnor Parish Council. Appleton with Eaton Parish Council argued that it should not be separated from the village of Cumnor, as it has strong community links and children from both parishes attend the same secondary school. North Hinksey supported the County Council's proposal, but also suggested an alternative with better electoral equality, which would divide the parish of Cumnor. Cumnor Parish Council opposed North Hinksey's alternative proposal, and submitted a pattern for part of the area which did not include the village of Radley in any division.

110 Having toured the area, we consider that Appleton with Eaton and the village of Cumnor are both distinct from the North Hinksey area. However, we also consider that the Botley Row area, which is contained in Cumnor parish and separated from Cumnor village by a dual carriageway, appears to have more in common with North Hinksey. Botley Row and North Hinksey town appear to form one community, across the parish boundary. Furthermore, Cumnor parish is currently divided by the existing electoral division boundary. We note that adopting North Hinksey's proposal and transferring the village of Cumnor out of North Hinksey & Cumnor division and into Kingston Bagpuize division would improve the electoral equality of North Hinksey division from 14% more electors to 5% electors in 2016.

111 We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's proposal for a single-member Kennington & Radley division with a variance of 6% more electors by 2016. Based on the lack of an alternative viable option in the Radley area, the evidence of community links provided by Appleton with Eaton Parish Council, the clear boundary of the dual carriageway and the high variance of the County Council's North Hinksey division, we consider that North Hinksey Parish Council's proposal for Cumnor and North Hinksey is the most appropriate option. We therefore recommend a single-

member Kingston & Cumnor division with a variance of 8% more electors and a single-member North Hinksey division with a variance of 5% more electors than the county average by 2016.

112 Overall, we recommend a pattern broadly based on the County Council's proposal in the west of the district, with an alternative proposal in the south east, a small modification in Abingdon, and North Hinksey Parish Council's proposal in the north.

113 Table C1 (on pages 39–44) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## West Oxfordshire District

114 West Oxfordshire lies in the west of the county. It comprises the towns of Carterton and Witney, as well as large villages and smaller hamlets. Currently West Oxfordshire is divided into 11 electoral divisions, returning 12 councillors. The district is entitled to 10 members under a 63-member scheme for Oxfordshire County Council.

115 As well as the county-wide scheme from the County Council, we received a district-wide submission from West Oxfordshire District Council. The two patterns were identical in all areas apart from Carterton. The West Oxfordshire Conservative Association supported the proposal from West Oxfordshire District Council. Submissions were also received from Bladon Parish Council, Carterton Town Council, Chadlington Parish Council and Tayton Parish Meeting.

116 In the northern part of the district the County Council proposed a single-member Charlbury & Wychwood division with a variance of 2% more electors; a single-member Chipping Norton division with a variance of 1% fewer electors; a single-member Hanborough & Minster Lovell division with a variance of 2% fewer electors; and a single-member Woodstock division with a variance of 1% fewer electors than the county average by 2016.

117 Chadlington Parish Council requested that the current boundaries be retained, while Bladon Parish Council expressed a wish to be in a Hanborough & Minster Lovell division rather than Woodstock division.

118 We note that Bladon is currently part of a Woodstock & Bladon district ward and also a part of the Hanborough division. However, placing Bladon in a Hanborough & Minster Lovell division rather than a Woodstock division would result in slightly poorer electoral equality, with variances of 6% more and 9% fewer electors for those two divisions, respectively. We consider that at this stage insufficient evidence has been provided to make this alteration to the County Council's proposal. Given the good levels of electoral equality achieved, we have decided to adopt the County Council's division pattern in the northern part of West Oxfordshire.

119 In Witney and the southern section of West Oxfordshire, the County Council proposed a single-member Witney North & East division with a variance of 13% more

electors; a single-member Witney South & Central division with a variance of 14% more electors; and a single-member Witney West & Bampton division with a variance of 3% more electors than the county average by 2016.

120 We consider that the Witney North & East division has strong boundaries, comprising the parish boundary (and edge of the urban area) to the east and the river to the west. No significant development is expected in this area. We have therefore decided to adopt the County Council's proposal as our draft recommendation.

121 We note that the neighbouring Witney South & Central division is projected to have a variance of 14% more electors than the county average by 2016, partly as a result of a small development in the north of this division. In order to improve the electoral equality, we recommend that approximately 500 electors are transferred from the proposed Witney South & Central division into the proposed Witney West & Bampton division. Our draft recommendations are therefore for a single-member Witney South & Central with a variance of 9% more and a single-member Witney West & Bampton with a variance of 8% more electors than the county average by 2016.

122 To the south of Witney, the County Council recommended a single-member Eynsham division with a variance of 2% fewer electors. We have received no other submissions specifically referring to this area, and so we adopt the County Council's Eynsham division as our draft recommendation.

123 In the west and Carterton area, the County Council proposed a single-member Carterton North division with a variance of 4% fewer electors and a single-member Burford & Carterton South division with a variance of 3% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. West Oxfordshire District Council proposed a single-member Carterton division with a variance of 4% fewer electors and a single-member Burford & Carterton North East division with a variance of 2% fewer electors than the county average by 2016. West Oxfordshire District Council did not provide any evidence to support this division pattern. Carterton town is too small to be represented by two councillors, so part of the town needs to be combined with the surrounding rural areas.

124 Carterton Town Council proposed one member for the whole town of Carterton, which would produce a variance of above 40%, and asked for the parish not to be divided. Carterton Town Council also opposed a two-member division comprising the whole of Carterton and the rural parishes. Such a two-member division would provide for good electoral equality, with a variance of 3% fewer electors than the county average. Taynton Parish Meeting, which is in the rural area surrounding Carterton, requested that the current rural division be retained.

125 We consider that the County Council's proposals, which would result in Carterton & Burford division completely encircling the town of Carterton, do not provide for clear community links. We also note that the majority of the parishes are to the north of the town, with the main roads entering Carterton from the north west. We therefore recommend that Carterton North West district ward be combined with the parishes rather than Carterton South district ward. This would result in slightly poorer electoral equality, with a single-member Carterton South & East division with

a variance of 8% fewer electors and a single-member Burford & Carterton division with a variance of 1% more electors than the county average by 2016. We consider that this alternative pattern would provide for good community links and better reflect our statutory criteria.

126 We recommend a single-member Carterton South & East division with a variance of 8% fewer electors and a single-member Burford & Carterton division with a variance of 1% more electors than the county average by 2016.

127 Overall, we recommend a pattern based on the County Council’s proposals, with a modification in Witney in order to improve electoral equality and an alternative pattern in Carterton to improve community and transport links.

128 Table C1 (on pages 39–44) provides details of the electoral variances for our proposed divisions across the entire county. The draft recommendations are shown on Map 1 accompanying this report.

## Conclusions

129 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2011 and 2016 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2011	2016
Number of councillors	63	63
Number of electoral divisions	61	61
Average number of electors per councillor	7,820	8,321
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	18	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	3	0

**Draft recommendation**

Oxfordshire County Council should comprise 63 councillors serving 61 divisions, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

130 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.

131 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, Oxfordshire 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.

132 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Abingdon, Banbury, Bicester, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cumnor, Didcot, Kidlington and Witney. We would particularly welcome comments on these proposals from the Abingdon, Banbury, Bicester, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cumnor, Didcot, Kidlington, Risinghurst & Sandhurst and Witney town and parish councils and local residents during this consultation stage.

133 Abingdon parish is presently divided into seven wards: Abbey & Barton (returning three members), Caldecott (returning three members), Dunmore (returning three members), Fitzharris (returning three members), Northcourt (returning three members), Ock Meadow (returning three members), and Peachcroft (returning three members). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Abingdon parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

### **Draft recommendation**

Abingdon Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Abbey & Barton (returning three members), Caldecott (returning three members), Dunmore (returning three members), Fitzharris (returning two members), Northcourt (returning three members), Ock Meadow (returning three members), Peachcroft (returning three members) and Wildmoor (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7a.

134 Banbury parish is presently divided into eight wards: Calthorpe (three parish councillors), Easington North (two parish councillors), Easington South (two parish councillors), Grimsbury & Castle (four parish councillors), Hardwick (four parish councillors), Neithrop North (one parish councillors), Neithrop South (two parish councillors) and Ruscote (four parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Banbury parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Banbury Town Council should comprise 22 councillors, as at present, representing eleven wards: Banbury Calthorpe (two parish councillors), Banbury Court (one parish councillor), Banbury Cross (one parish councillor), Banbury Easington North (two parish councillors), Banbury Easington South (two parish councillors), Banbury Grimsbury & Castle (three parish councillors), Banbury Hardwick (four parish councillors), Banbury Neithrop North (two parish councillors), Banbury Neithrop South (one parish councillor), Banbury Ruscote (four parish councillors) and Banbury St John (one parish councillor). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2.

135 Bicester parish is presently divided into five wards: East (three parish councillors), North (three parish councillors), South (three parish councillors), Town (three parish councillors) and West (three parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Bicester parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Bicester Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Bicester East (three parish councillors), Bicester Central (one parish councillor), Bicester North (three parish councillors), Bicester South East (three parish councillors), Bicester South West (one parish councillor), Bicester Town (two parish councillors) and Bicester West (two parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3a.

136 Bodicote parish is not presently divided into wards and returns 10 parish councillors. 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Bodicote parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Bodicote Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bodicote Village (returning eight members) and Bodicote Bankside (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 2.

137 Chesterton parish is not presently divided into wards and returns 6 parish councillors. 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Chesterton parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Chesterton Parish Council should comprise six councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chesterton Village (returning four members) and Chesterton North (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3a.

138 Cumnor parish is presently divided into three wards: Dean Court (six parish councillors), Farmoor (three parish councillors) and Village (six parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Cumnor parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Cumnor Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Dean Court (seven parish councillors), Farmoor (three parish councillors) and Village (five parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4b.

139 Didcot parish is presently divided into four wards: All Saints (five parish councillors), Ladygrove (six parish councillors), Northbourne (five parish councillors) and Park (five parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Didcot parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Didcot Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: All Saints (five parish councillors), Ladygrove (six parish councillors), Northbourne (four parish councillors), Park (four parish councillors) and Willowcroft (two parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7b.

140 Kidlington parish is presently divided into five wards: Dogwood (three parish councillors), Exeter (three parish councillors), Orchard (three parish councillors), Roundham (three parish councillors) and St Mary's (three parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Kidlington parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Kidlington Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Kidlington Dogwood (three parish councillors), Kidlington Exeter (three parish councillors), Kidlington Orchard (three parish councillors), Kidlington Roundham (three parish councillors) and Kidlington St Mary's (three parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 3b.

141 Risinghurst & Sandhills parish is presently divided into three wards: Risinghurst (12 parish councillors), Sandhills (five parish councillors) and Wood Farm (three parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Risinghurst & Sandhills parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Risinghurst & Sandhills Parish Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Risinghurst North (six parish councillors), Risinghurst South (six parish councillors), Sandhills (five parish councillors) and Wood Farm (three parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 6.

142 St Helen Without parish is presently divided into two wards: Dry Sandford (five parish councillors) and Shippon (five parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for St Helen Without parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

St Helen Without Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Dry Sandford (five parish councillors), Shippon (four parish councillors) and Spey (one parish councillor). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7a.

143 Witney parish is presently divided into five wards: Central (three parish councillors), East (four parish councillors), North (three parish councillors), Witney (four parish councillors) and Witney (three parish councillors). 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 are proposing revised electoral arrangements for Witney parish to reflect our proposed division arrangements in this area.

**Draft recommendation**

Witney Town Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Witney Burwell (one parish councillor), Witney Central (three parish councillors), Witney East (four parish councillors), Witney North (three parish councillors), Witney South (three parish councillors) and Witney West (three parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4a.

### 3 What happens next?

144 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 Oxfordshire 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.

145 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Oxfordshire 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.

146 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer**  
**Oxfordshire 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)

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

147 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 Oxfordshire 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.

148 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.

149 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.

150 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 Oxfordshire County Council in 2013.

## 4 Mapping

### Draft recommendations for Oxfordshire

151 The following maps illustrate our proposed division boundaries for Oxfordshire County Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed division boundaries for Oxfordshire.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2** illustrates the proposed divisions in Banbury.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Bicester.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Kidlington.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Witney.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Cumnor and North Hinksey.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5** illustrates the proposed divisions in the west of Oxford.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6** illustrates the proposed divisions in the east of Oxford.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7a** illustrates the proposed divisions in Abingdon.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7b** illustrates the proposed divisions in Didcot.



# 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

	<p>candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</p>
<p>PER (or periodic electoral review)</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Political management arrangements</p>	<p>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</p>
<p>Town Council</p>	<p>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></p>
<p>Under-represented</p>	<p>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</p>
<p>Variance (or electoral variance)</p>	<p>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</p>
<p>Ward</p>	<p>A specific area of a district or borough, 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 borough council</p>



## 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.
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 Oxfordshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
<b>Divisions in Cherwell District</b>								
1	Banbury Calthorpe	1	5,617	5,617	-28%	8,058	8,058	-3%
2	Banbury Grimsbury & Castle	1	7,420	7,420	-5%	7,563	7,563	-9%
3	Banbury Hardwick	1	8,594	8,594	10%	8,824	8,824	6%
4	Banbury Ruscote	1	7,779	7,779	-1%	8,716	8,716	5%
5	Bicester North	1	7,025	7,025	-10%	7,674	7,674	-8%
6	Bicester Town	1	6,916	6,916	-12%	7,851	7,851	-6%
7	Bicester West	1	5,709	5,709	-27%	8,508	8,508	2%
8	Bloxham & Easington	1	7,444	7,444	-5%	7,805	7,805	-6%
9	Deddington	1	8,642	8,642	11%	8,104	8,104	-3%
10	Kidlington	1	7,536	7,536	-4%	7,634	7,634	-8%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
11	Kirtlington	1	9,013	9,013	15%	8,636	8,636	4%
12	Otmoor	1	7,950	7,950	2%	8,102	8,102	-3%
13	Ploughley	1	6,327	6,327	-19%	7,715	7,715	-7%
14	Wroxton & Hook Norton	1	8,619	8,619	10%	8,491	8,491	2%
<b>Divisions in Oxford City</b>								
15	Barton, Sandhills & Risinghurst	1	6,918	6,918	-12%	8,356	8,356	0%
16	Churchill & Lye Valley	1	8,800	8,800	13%	8,570	8,570	3%
17	Cowley	1	8,444	8,444	8%	8,218	8,218	-1%
18	Headington & Quarry	1	8,164	8,164	4%	8,372	8,372	1%
19	Iffley Fields & St Mary's	1	7,852	7,852	0%	8,069	8,069	-3%
20	Isis	1	8,163	8,163	4%	8,396	8,396	1%
21	Jericho & Osney	1	7,905	7,905	1%	8,449	8,449	2%
22	Leys	1	8,524	8,524	9%	8,493	8,493	2%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Marston & Northway	1	8,379	8,379	7%	8,197	8,197	-1%
24	Rose Hill & Littlemore	1	7,436	7,436	-5%	8,144	8,144	-2%
25	St Clement's & Cowley Marsh	1	7,752	7,752	-1%	8,007	8,007	-4%
26	St Margaret's	1	8,034	8,034	3%	8,364	8,364	1%
27	University Parks	1	7,660	7,660	-2%	8,632	8,632	4%
28	Wolvercote & Summertown	1	7,617	7,617	-3%	8,386	8,386	1%
<b>Divisions in South Oxfordshire District</b>								
29	Benson	1	8,246	8,246	5%	8,524	8,524	2%
30	Berinsfield & Garsington	1	8,282	8,282	6%	8,394	8,394	1%
31	Chalgrove & Watlington	1	9,142	9,142	17%	8,916	8,916	7%
32	Didcot East & Hagbourne	1	7,582	7,582	-3%	8,175	8,175	-2%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
33	Didcot Ladygrove	1	5,727	5,727	-27%	7,321	7,321	-12%
34	Didcot West	1	6,442	6,442	-18%	8,770	8,770	5%
35	Goring	1	8,838	8,838	13%	8,567	8,567	3%
36	Henley-on-Thames	1	8,972	8,972	15%	8,972	8,972	8%
37	Sonning Common	1	7,926	7,926	1%	7,713	7,713	-7%
38	Thame & Chinnor	2	15,540	7,770	-1%	16,411	8,206	-1%
39	Wallingford	1	7,763	7,763	-1%	8,010	8,010	-4%
40	Wheatley	1	7,607	7,607	-3%	7,926	7,926	-5%
<b>Divisions in Vale of White Horse District</b>								
41	Abingdon East	1	7,931	7,931	1%	8,174	8,174	-2%
42	Abingdon North	1	9,238	9,238	18%	8,892	8,892	7%
43	Abingdon South	1	8,595	8,595	10%	8,849	8,849	6%
44	Faringdon	1	6,515	6,515	-17%	7,888	7,888	-5%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
45	Grove & Wantage	2	14,352	7,176	-8%	17,533	8,767	5%
48	Hendreds & Harwell	1	7,066	7,066	-10%	8,288	8,288	0%
46	Kennington & Radley	1	8,707	8,707	11%	8,840	8,840	6%
47	Kingston & Cumnor	1	8,802	8,802	13%	9,026	9,026	8%
49	North Hinksey	1	7,732	7,732	-1%	8,749	8,749	5%
50	Shrivenham	1	7,429	7,429	-5%	7,567	7,567	-9%
51	Sutton Courtenay & Marcham	1	7,380	7,380	-6%	7,615	7,615	-8%
<b>Divisions in West Oxfordshire District</b>								
52	Burford & Carterton	1	7,708	7,708	-1%	8,437	8,437	1%
53	Carterton South & East	1	7,095	7,095	-9%	7,647	7,647	-8%
54	Charlbury & Wychwood	1	7,926	7,926	1%	8,458	8,458	2%

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

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2011)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2016)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
55	Chipping Norton	1	8,267	8,267	6%	8,185	8,185	-2%
56	Eynsham	1	7,979	7,979	2%	8,183	8,183	-2%
57	Hanborough & Minster Lovell	1	8,204	8,204	5%	8,186	8,186	-2%
58	Witney North & East	1	9,006	9,006	15%	9,392	9,392	13%
59	Witney South & Central	1	8,189	8,189	5%	9,055	9,055	9%
60	Witney West and Bampton	1	8,236	8,236	5%	8,991	8,991	8%
61	Woodstock	1	8,006	8,006	2%	8,208	8,208	-1%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>492,669</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>524,196</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>7,820</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>8,321</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Oxfordshire 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.