

Non-principal Councils' submissions to the "Striking the Right Balance" and "On The Right Lines" Consultations

This PDF document contains submissions from bodies and individuals (S-W) other than the principal councils in the consultation.

Some versions of Adobe allow the viewer to move quickly between bookmarks.

Click on the submission you would like to view. If you are not taken to that page, please scroll through the document.



staffordshire-parish-cou
rcils-consultation-respon
se-2010-11-22



st-martin-shropshire-p...



web-form-326-consult...



web-form-327-consult...



web-form-332-consult...



web-form-333-consult...



web-form-334-consult...



web-form-335-consult...



web-form-336-consult...



web-form-347-consult...



web-form-349-2011-...



whitlock-cllr-maggie-c...



woodhall-spa-parish-c...

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 14:38
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Staffordshire Parish Councils Association

David Owen Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
3rd Floor Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
Fax: 0270 7296 6227
e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: Staffordshire Parish Councils Association [REDACTED]

Sent: 22 November 2010 09:56

To: Futures@ (LGBCE)

Subject: consultation

Impressive document.

Particularly pleasing to note that someone is aware of “consultation overload” and comforting to realise that, in deciding electoral equality, the system will deal with “knowns” rather than “unknowns”. If only I could remember the quote by Donald Rumsfeld.

Regards

Viv Evans
Chief Executive
<http://www.spconline.org.uk>

Staffordshire County Council - An Award Winning Authority

See the awards we've won at: www.staffordshire.gov.uk/yourcouncil/mycc/ourawards/

For more information about the services the county council provides, click here:
www.staffordshire.gov.uk/yourcouncil/atoz/Search.aspx

Join the battle to bring the Staffordshire Hoard home at www.artfund.org/hoard

Disclaimer

This e-mail (including any attachments) is only for the person or organisation it is addressed to. If you are not the intended recipient you must let me know immediately and then delete this e-mail. If you use this e-mail without permission, or if you allow anyone else to see, copy or distribute the e-mail, or if you do, or don't do something because you have read this e-mail, you may be breaking the law.

Liability cannot be accepted for any loss or damage arising from this e-mail (or any attachments) or from incompatible scripts or any virus transmitted.

E-mails and attachments sent to or received from staff and elected Members may be monitored and read and the right is reserved to reject or return or delete any which are considered to be inappropriate or unsuitable.

Do you really need to print this email? It will use paper, add to your waste disposal costs and harm the environment.

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 14:53
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: St Martin's Parish Council
Attachments: boundary response.doc

David Owen Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
3rd Floor Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
Fax: 0270 7296 6227
e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: Sue Crow - Clerk [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 December 2010 09:33
To: Owen, David
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: : Consultation on Policy and Procedures for Electoral Reviews and Principal Area Boundary Reviews

Dear Mr Owen,

Please find attached St Martin's, Shropshire, Parish Council's response to the consultation. We hope that it will influence future consultations. The council is disappointed not to be able to comment in a more positive way on such an important issue.

Regards

Sue Crow, Clerk to St Martin's Parish Council

ST MARTINS PARISH COUNCIL

Mrs S R Crow. Clerk



20/012/2010

Dear,

**Consultation on Policy and Procedures for Electoral Reviews and
Principal Area Boundary Reviews**

St Martins Parish Council at their December meeting made the following response

The Council found it difficult to understand what kind of response is wanted and commented that the document It is not in plain English.

The council does not have the specialist knowledge to answer the questions, or the knowledge to understand the implications of any answer they may have given.

If parish councillors are expected to respond to such consultations then they need training in order to be able to give an informed response.

These consultations should come with background information, giving layman a range of options, .eg benefits /disadvantages of each approach.

I would point out that all council illors had a copy of the document well before the meeting.

Yours sincerely,

Clerk

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:03
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW:Custom Form 326

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 21 December 2010 12:58
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	326
Time of Submission:	Dec 21st 2010 at 12:58pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

Yes, these are clearly defined principles which provide clarity for

- by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:
- any Council considering a potential review.
- 1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:
- Yes, we feel they are appropriate and comprehensive.
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:
- Yes, identifying different types of review would be helpful as some are likely to be much more extensive than others.
- 3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:
- Yes, using said criteria for determining Council size would be appropriate.
- 3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:
- In addition to the elements set out, we would suggest that reference also needed to be made to the wider role played by regional capitals such as Newcastle.
- 4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:
- Yes, the status as detailed in Figure 2 are logical
- 4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:
- Yes, reviews need to be managed tightly and undertaken as quickly as possible.
- 4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:
- Yes, the proposed timescale should be appropriate having regard to the Council's decision making framework.
- 5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:
- Yes, as electorate forecasts for years ahead can be so imprecise.

5b. How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend shortterm imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:

You might want to comment about matters that do not appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

Data supplied by planning policy along with policy and research staff provide some guide as to likely changes in electorate over a five year period. The status of each forecast needs to be born in mind as, for example there is more likelihood of a development being completed if building has already begun or planning permission had been granted compared to a scheme which is still at the formative stage.

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:03
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 327

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 21 December 2010 13:55
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	327
Time of Submission:	Dec 21st 2010 at 1:55pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

Yes, these are clearly defined principles which provide clarity for

- by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:
- any Council considering a potential review.
- 1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:
- Yes, we feel they are appropriate and comprehensive.
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:
- Yes, identifying different types of review would be helpful as some are likely to be much more extensive than others,
- 3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:
- Yes, using such criteria for determining Council size would be appropriate.
- 3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:
- In addition to the elements set out, we would suggest that reference also needed to be made to the wider role played by regional capitals such as Newcastle.
- 4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:
- Yes, the stages as detailed in Figure 2 are logical.
- 4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:
- Yes, reviews need to be managed tightly and undertaken as quickly as possible.
- 4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:
- Yes, the proposed timescale should be appropriate having regard to the Council's decision making framework.
- 5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:
- Yes, as electorate forecasts for years ahead can be so imprecise.

5b. How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend shortterm imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:

You might want to comment about matters that do not appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

Data supplied by Planning Policy along with Policy and Research staff provide some guide as to likely changes in electorate over a five year period. The status of each forecast needs to be borne in mind as, for example there is more likelihood of a development being completed if building has already begun or planning permission had been granted compared to a scheme which is still at the formative stage.

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:18
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 332

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 23 December 2010 15:08
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	On the right lines? - PABR feedback form (#12129)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/on-the-right-lines--pabr-feedback-form
Submission ID:	332
Time of Submission:	Dec 23rd 2010 at 3:08pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that classifying PABRs is helpful and is the	The proposed classification does not take account of the impact of a proposal in terms of the future political control/balance of an area or group of areas. This issue may be fundamental in addressing the
---	--

- proposed classification appropriate?: sensitivity of a proposal and should be identified at an early stage. Otherwise the proposed classification of reviews is helpful.
- 1b. Under what circumstances should "compound" reviews be carried out?: Cross boundary reviews should only happen with the agreement in advance of all the local authorities concerned.
- 2a. Are the review criteria relevant and/or should there be other criteria?: Minimum size of proposed electoral area?
- 2b. Do you think that local authorities and others would be able to assemble evidence showing how a proposed boundary change would have merits in terms of the criteria?: A clearer set of indicators against which to benchmark quantitatively and qualitatively should be considered to avoid a repeat of the complex, time-consuming and wasteful processes used by the Boundary Committee when considering "bids" for unitary status in 2007/10.
3. Is the initiation process clear and reasonable? If not, how could it be improved?: The "gateway" procedures outlined provide a costly bureaucratic framework but no straightforward "bar" over which councils should pass at the outset. An objective financial test at the initial stage might be helpful. The approach proposed runs the risk of emphasising form over substance; with creating bureaucracy rather than delivering outcomes.
4. Is the Commission's approach to evidence of local support clear and appropriate?: In general, yes. Councils should have the option for an on line only "advisory local poll". Any other approach is bureaucratic and expensive.
5. Is the assurance required about the financial implications of proposed changes clear and reasonable?: See answer to 2b.
6. Is the Commission's overall approach to consequential electoral arrangements clear and reasonable?: Yes
7. How much notice of the Commission's intention to undertake a review would be necessary in order to give councils sufficient time to prepare the evidence to demonstrate the merits 6 months

and other impact of a change to their boundaries?:

8. Are there any other matters which might be the subject of appropriate prompts?: The model of local authority service the prompts appear to envisage is of direct local authority service delivery. The Localism Bill is moving away from this approach; the prompts should perhaps reflect that.

In addition to thinking about the questions, you might want to add

comment about things which don't appear in this document: The view expressed at para 16 of the paper - that all affected local authorities should agree to any PABR taking place - is endorsed.

please feel free to do so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:30
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 333

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 24 December 2010 14:12
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	On the right lines? - PABR feedback form (#12129)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/on-the-right-lines--pabr-feedback-form
Submission ID:	333
Time of Submission:	Dec 24th 2010 at 2:11pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that classifying PABRs is helpful and is the	Think it is helpful and appropriate
---	-------------------------------------

proposed classification appropriate?:

1b. Under what circumstances should "compound" reviews be carried out?:

As outlined in the consultation. However, they should be as an exception rather than the norm

2a. Are the review criteria relevant and/or should there be other criteria?:

Think it may be worthwhile having a criteria around physical barriers/characteristics as these may be important in the review process

2b. Do you think that local authorities and others would be able to assemble evidence showing how a proposed boundary change would have merits in terms of the criteria?:

Yes, although resourcing around this may prove an issue

3. Is the initiation process clear and reasonable? If not, how could it be improved?:

Seems reasonable

4. Is the Commission's approach to evidence of local support clear and appropriate?:

Yes

5. Is the assurance required about the financial implications of proposed changes clear and reasonable?:

Yes

6. Is the Commission's overall approach to consequential electoral arrangements clear and reasonable?:

Yes

7. How much notice of the Commission's intention to undertake a review would be necessary in order to give councils sufficient time to prepare the evidence to demonstrate the merits and other impact of a change to their

Much depends on the nature and scale of the review and the resource implications - suggest 2 to 6 months

boundaries?:

8. Are there any other matters which might be the subject of appropriate prompts?:

See response to "a above in terms of physical barriers/characteristics

In addition to thinking about the questions,

you might want to add comment about things

I think that over a period there will be increasing focus on member representation and reducing the number of members at all levels.

which don't appear in this document:

Simplified guidance and procedure around that would be most welcome

please feel free to do

so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:31
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 334

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 24 December 2010 14:28
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	334
Time of Submission:	Dec 24th 2010 at 2:28pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:	Very helpful
1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:	Would also suggest you need to factor in cost and VFM, which are becoming increasing concerns
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:	Yes
3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:	Yes
3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:	As 1b above - cost and VFM
4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:	Yes
4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:	Yes, although think much depends on the size,role,complexities of the authority
4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:	Seems fine
5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:	Seems sensible approach

5b. How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend shortterm imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:

Think much depends on the credibility of the forecast and its authorship

You might want to comment about matters that do not appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

N/A

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:39
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 335

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 29 December 2010 10:05
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	On the right lines? - PABR feedback form (#12129)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/on-the-right-lines--pabr-feedback-form
Submission ID:	335
Time of Submission:	Dec 29th 2010 at 10:05am
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that classifying PABRs is helpful and is the

The classification of PABRs is helpful and the proposed classification is appropriate and will assist Councilâ€™s in

proposed classification determining the process for particular reviews.
appropriate?:

1b. Under what
circumstances should
the Commission's
reviews be carried
out?:

Compound reviews should be undertaken where issues are raised through the consultation process which suggests there is support for reviewing other boundary anomalies.

2a. Are the review
criteria relevant and/or
should there be other
criteria?:

The review criteria are appropriate.

2b. Do you think that
local authorities and
others would be able to
assemble evidence
showing how a
proposed boundary
change would have
merits in terms of the
criteria?:

Local authorities would be well placed to demonstrate whether boundary changes had merits in terms of the criteria set out.

3. Is the initiation
process clear and
reasonable? If not,
how could it be
improved?:

The initiation process proposed for PABRs is reasonable and clear.

4. Is the
Commission's
approach to evidence
of local support clear
and appropriate?:

The costs of local surveys and/or polls would need to be considered as part of the review.

5. Is the assurance
required about the
financial implications
of proposed changes
clear and reasonable?:

The certification by s.151 Officers as to the financial implications of the proposed changes is clear and reasonable.

6. Is the
Commission's
overall approach to
consequential electoral
arrangements clear and
reasonable?:

Yes

7. How much notice of
the Commission's
intention to undertake
a review would be
necessary in order to
give councils sufficient
time to prepare the
evidence to
demonstrate the merits
and other impact of a
change to their

This would be dependent on the scale of the review proposed and therefore the amount of information the Council would be required to submit.

boundaries?:

8. Are there any other matters which might be the subject of appropriate prompts?:

In addition to thinking about the questions, you might want to add comment about things which don't appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:39
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 336

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 29 December 2010 10:07
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	336
Time of Submission:	Dec 29th 2010 at 10:07am
IP Address:	XXXXXXXXXX

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

- by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:
- The proposed principles are helpful, appropriate and adequate.
- 1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:
- The proposed principles are helpful, appropriate and adequate.
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:
- The classification of types of review is helpful and will enable Councils™ to clearly determine the process to be undertaken for a particular review.
- 3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:
- The criteria-based approach proposed is desirable as it will reflect local constitutions and as well as the role of elected members in representing their communities.
- 3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:
- The elements provide a more appropriate method of determining council size as it will reflect the local decision-making processes in place and the volume of business to be considered.
- 4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:
- Yes the stages are clear and appropriate.
- 4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:
- Yes trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful, however it is noted that even the simplest "type A"™ review still takes at least six months to complete with the most complex reviews taking 12 months.
- 4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:
- Councils have the ability to convene special meetings if their frequency of meetings does not allow for decisions to be made within the timeframes suggested.
- 5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five years™ time?:
- For the reasons set out in the paper (ie that developments predicted to take place may not materialise) it is appropriate to focus reviews on maximising electoral equality at the first election.

5b. How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend shortterm imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:

There would need to be hard evidence that electoral imbalance would be corrected within the five-year timeframe.

You might want to comment about matters that do not appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 15:58
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 347

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
 3rd Floor Layden House
 76-86 Turnmill Street
 London
 EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
 Fax: 0270 7296 6227
 e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 07 January 2011 15:20
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	347
Time of Submission:	Jan 7th 2011 at 3:19pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:	YES
1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:	YES
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:	YES
3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:	YES
3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:	YES
4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:	YES
4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:	YES
4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:	YES
5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a review from the maximisation of equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:	NO

5b. How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend shortterm imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five yearsâ€™ time?:

One can only use planning/population estimates linked to help with this. The problem occurs when there is a slowdown in the economy and housebuilding slows so that electorated do not meet the "target".

You might want to comment about matters that do not appear in this document: please feel free to do so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 16:00
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW: Custom Form 349

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
3rd Floor Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
Fax: 0270 7296 6227
e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: futures@lgbce.org.uk [mailto:futures@lgbce.org.uk]
Sent: 10 January 2011 16:27
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Custom Form Submission Received



- Custom Form Submission Notification

Custom Form Submission Received

Futures LGBCE,

A new custom form submission has been received. The details of the form submission are as follows:

Submission Information

Custom Form:	Striking the right balance - Electoral reviews feedback form (#12128)
Form URL:	http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities/striking-the-right-balance-electoral-reviews-feedback-form
Submission ID:	349
Time of Submission:	Jan 10th 2011 at 4:26pm
IP Address:	[REDACTED]

Form Answers

1a. Do you think that setting out principles

by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?:	The principles appear helpful.
1b. Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate? If not, what other principles should be adopted?:	They seem to be
2. Is the classification of types of review set out appropriate and adequate?:	As AEA - namely The three types of review set out in the paper appear both logical and sensible with the exception of Type A. In this case, given the wording of the last sentence (‘œmay not be necessary’?), it is possible that the previous considerations may or may not be revisited. For the sake of clarity, it would be better if the wording was revised to indicate that, in such circumstances (i.e. the 10 years time limit and no new arguments), the previous considerations will not be revisited.
3a. Is a criteria based approach to determining council-size desirable?:	it appears so
3b. Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate? If not, what other elements should be included?:	it appears so
4a. Are the stages of the reviews as shown in Figure 1 clear and appropriate?:	it appears so
4b. Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?:	yes
4c. Does the timescale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?:	There are too many variables to effectively comment
5a. Should LGBCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral equality at the first election to follow a	no comment

review from the
maximisation of
equality in five
yearsâ€™ time?:

5b. How should we
decide whether a
forecast of future
patterns of electorate is
sufficiently reliable to
encourage us to no comment
recommend shortterm
imbalances in favour
of good electoral
equality in five
yearsâ€™ time?:

You might want to
comment about
matters that do not
appear in this
document: please feel
free to do so.:

This communication is from **LGBCE** (<http://www.lgbce.org.uk>) - Sent to **Futures LGBCE**

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 14:43
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: Consultation FW:Cllr Maggie Whitlock
Attachments: Local Government Review.doc

David Owen Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
3rd Floor Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
Fax: 0270 7296 6227
e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: Maggie Whitlock [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 December 2010 23:40
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: Response to Local Government Boundary Review

Dear Boundary Commission,

Please find attached my comments on the above.

Cllr Maggie Whitlock
North Cave Parish Council

Principles

Question: 1a

Do you think that setting out principles by which electoral reviews are conducted is helpful?

Answer :

Yes I do; it adds to openness and transparency of local government.

Question: 1b

Are the principles set out above appropriate and adequate?

If not , what other principles should be adopted?

Some of the principles are ambiguous and lack detail.

First principle states that local councils should define *the manner of their policies*..(what does this mean?)..and the way in which services are delivered.

Recommend that; there is an audit of policies set against a standard and that each local authority is performance manage regionally.

Second principle the only way I can see in supporting councils to make changes is not only to look at populations but also social deprivation urban and rural, unemployment , child education, nutrition and adequate housing in populations.

Fourth Principle; its more than numbers. There may be wards with a high number of affluent people , retired people and areas of social deprivation. May be in the socially deprived areas the numbers may be low but the effort required to improve lives is greater.

Seventh Principle; How can you review something if you don't know what you (outcome) you want to achieve. The Outcome may not be what you predicted but you can determine the process taken to get the decision.

Ninth Principle: Who are "key partners"? What's in house desk research? What about using NHS observatories etc.

Elected Councillors should be performance managed, ie are they doing the job they were elected to carry out. Independent scrutiny is required especially in contracting and planning.

Question :3a

Is a criteria based approach to determining council size desirable?

Yes it is, because it is open, transparent and fair.

Question 3b

Are the elements set out above for criteria-based decisions appropriate and adequate?

If not, what other elements should be included?

I think they are adequate but I don't know how appropriate.

I would like to see audit tools for each of the broad elements described.

A matching of the electoral ward and health and social care provision is an essential part.

Question: 4a

Are the stages and reviews as shown in Fig 1 clear and appropriate?

Yes I do.

Question 4b

Do you think that trying to reduce the duration of review periods is helpful?

Yes I do .

Question 4c

Does the time scale for each stage provide sufficient opportunity for councils and other bodies to make necessary decisions, having regard to the frequency and timing of formal council meetings?

Yes I do, there may be a need for an extraordinary meeting but that's OK.

Question 5a

Should LG BCE shift the emphasis to maximising electoral inequality at the first election to follow a review from maximisation of equality in five years time?

Yes I do because in 5 years time further drift of population changes will have occurred.

Question 5b

How should we decide whether a forecast of future patterns of electorate is sufficiently reliable to encourage us to recommend short term imbalances in favour of good electoral equality in five years?

Through research via a retrospective study of trends in population shift, social deprivation and unemployment rates. Qualitative research.

Dunkeyson, Nicholas

From: Owen, David
Sent: 17 January 2011 14:47
To: Gregory, Eleanor
Subject: consultation FW:Woodhall Spa Parish Council

David Owen
Policy & Research Officer

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
3rd Floor Layden House
76-86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 020 7664 8532
Fax: 0270 7296 6227
e-mail: david.owen@lgbce.org.uk

www.lgbce.org.uk

From: Amanda Bushell [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 December 2010 15:25
To: Futures@ (LGBCE)
Subject: consultation on policies and principle area boundary reviews

Dear Sir/Madam

Woodhall Spa Parish Council considered the above consultation document and wishes to make a comment against Question 7:

How much notice of a review would be necessary if councils are to have sufficient time to prepare the evidence to demonstrate the merits and other impact of a change to their boundaries?

The time needed for consultation would depend on the scale of the review, but local authorities should be given a minimum of 6 months notice of a review.

Kindest Regards

Amanda Bushell
Clerk to the Council

[REDACTED]