

# Final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Cherwell District Council

Electoral review

May 2015

## **Translations and other formats**

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2015

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Warding patterns	6
Draft recommendations	7
Final recommendations	7
Banbury	8
Bicester	11
Rural Cherwell, including Kidlington	12
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15

3 What happens next?	17
----------------------	----

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Cherwell District Council	18
B Submissions received	20
C Glossary and abbreviations	21



# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Cherwell?

We are conducting an electoral review of Cherwell District Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in district council elections varies depending on where you live in Cherwell. Overall, 36% of wards currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the district.

## Our proposals for Cherwell

Cherwell District Council currently has 50 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a reduction in council size by two to 48 members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

As Cherwell District Council elects by thirds, the Commission aimed to produce a pattern of three-member wards. Our final recommendations therefore propose that Cherwell District Council's 48 councillors should represent 16 three-member wards across the district. None of our proposed wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Cherwell by 2020.

**We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Cherwell.**



# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review has been conducted following our decision to review Cherwell District Council's ('the Council's) electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the district.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 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)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held three periods of consultation: first on council size, secondly on warding patterns for the Council and thirdly on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
7 January 2014	Council size consultation
29 April 2014	Warding pattern consultation
9 December 2014	Draft recommendations consultation
17 February 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
12 May 2015	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

---

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

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

6 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  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>2</sup> 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 wards we put forward at the end of the review.

8 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	<b>2013</b>	<b>2020</b>
Electorate of Cherwell District	109,649	123,835
Number of councillors	48	48
Average number of electors per councillor	2,284	2,580

10 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the district by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Cherwell.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Cherwell District 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.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices (by appointment). All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Electors refer to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 13% to 2020. The growth will largely be driven by substantial new housing developments planned for Banbury and Bicester.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

16 Prior to consultation, Cherwell District Council submitted a proposal to reduce the council size from 50 to 48. During consultation on council size we received 19 submissions. These were from 11 parish and town councils, three district councillors and four local residents. Adderbury Parish Council provided two submissions. The Council did not submit a representation at this stage.

17 We carefully considered the representations received during consultation. We considered that the Council's original submission proposing a council size of 48 was supported by adequate evidence to justify a reduction in size. We were content that the Council had sufficiently demonstrated that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively under this council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. The majority of submissions received supported the Council's proposal. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 48 as the basis of this electoral review and invited proposals or warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

18 We received no submissions that opposed the council size in response to consultation on our draft recommendations. We therefore confirm a council size of 48 as final.

## Warding patterns

19 During consultation on warding patterns, we received 22 submissions, including three district-wide proposals. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district.

20 The three district-wide schemes provided a uniform warding arrangement of three-member wards for the district. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of wards resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the district and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

## Draft recommendations

21 We received 33 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. The majority of submissions received were in relation to our proposals for Banbury and the rural area of Cherwell.

### **Banbury**

22 Submissions for Banbury mainly expressed concern at the number of town council wards created as a result of our proposed district wards not being coterminous with the Oxfordshire County Council electoral divisions. While the number of town council wards is not one of the Commission's statutory criteria, we did consider that the high number of town wards proposed for Banbury would not best represent effective and convenient local government. We have therefore amended three of our district ward boundaries in Banbury to decrease the number of town council wards required.

### **Rural Cherwell**

23 We received differing proposals for the warding pattern in the rural area of Cherwell. In particular, we received both support for and opposition to our proposed Adderbury, Bloxham & Bodicote and Deddington wards. We received an alternative proposal which placed Adderbury parish into Deddington ward and included the parishes of Hook Norton, Milcombe, Wigginton and South Newington in a ward with Bloxham & Bodicote rather than in Deddington.

24 While the alternative proposal provided a good level of electoral equality we consider that our original pattern of wards provided the best balance of our statutory criteria. We are therefore confirming our draft wards in this area as final.

## Final recommendations

25 The tables on pages 8–14 detail our final recommendations for each area of Cherwell. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

## Banbury

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2019	Description	Detail
<b>Banbury Calthorpe &amp; Easington</b>	3	6%	This ward comprises the southern part of Banbury town, including the residential areas on both sides of Bloxham Road and Oxford Road.	<p>We received one submission specifically relating to this ward. The respondent commented that the Hightown Road area would be better included in this ward than in Banbury Grimsbury and Hightown. We did not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to support this assertion.</p> <p>As a consequence of our changes to the boundaries of Banbury Ruscote we are now including the streets north of Broughton Road and west of Queensway in our Banbury Calthorpe &amp; Easington ward. The ward boundary will now follow the county division boundary in this area.</p> <p>With the exception of this modification we confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Banbury Cross &amp; Neithrop</b>	3	8%	This ward includes Banbury town centre and extends north to Oxford Canal, east to the railway line, south to the junction of Bloxham Road and Queensway and west to the streets behind Woodgreen Leisure Centre.	<p>We received three submissions relating to this ward. Two respondents to our consultation commented that the name of the ward should be changed to reflect the inclusion of the Neithrop area. We have therefore changed the ward name from Banbury Cross &amp; Castle to Banbury Cross &amp; Neithrop.</p> <p>Another respondent opposed this proposed ward, commenting that the Longelandes Way estate would be better included in Banbury Hardwick or Banbury Ruscote wards. Making this modification would necessitate a series of consequential changes to the wards across Banbury. We do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify these modifications. With the exception of the name change, we therefore confirm our draft recommendation as final.</p>

<b>Banbury Grimsbury &amp; Hightown</b>	3	7%	This ward includes the eastern part of the town. It is bounded to the north and east by the district boundary. The western boundary is the A4260 and the southern boundary runs behind the properties on Hightown Leyes, Foscothe Rise and Meadow View.	We received two submissions specifically relating to this ward. One respondent stated that they consider Windsor Street a through road rather than a boundary. Another proposed that the Hightown Road area should be included in Banbury Calthorpe & Easington rather than in Banbury Grimsbury & Hightown. We consider that our arrangement provides a better reflection of community links and a better balance of the statutory criteria. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Banbury Hardwick</b>	3	4%	This ward comprises the northern part of Banbury, including Hardwick, the Hanwell Fields estate and the new developments off Dukes Meadow Drive.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this ward. All commented that Trinity Close should not be included in the ward as it is part of the Ruscote area. Two made the same comment about Warwick Road. We have therefore amended the southern boundary of the ward. The boundary will now run along the middle of Warwick Road from the western edge of Banbury to the end of Ferndale Road, from where it will now run behind the houses on the north side of Warwick Road as far as Ruscote Avenue. The ward boundary will now follow the county division boundary in this area. With the exception of this modification we confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p> <p>Another respondent proposed including the Longelandes Way estate in Banbury Hardwick or Banbury Ruscote wards rather than in Banbury Cross &amp; Neithrop ward. Making this modification would necessitate a series of consequential changes to the wards across Banbury. We do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify these modifications.</p>

<p><b>Banbury Ruscote</b></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>9%</p>	<p>This ward comprises the Ruscote and Neithrop residential areas, as far north as Warwick Road and extending south to Broughton Road. It extends west to the edge of the town and east to the back of Woodgreen Leisure Centre.</p>	<p>We received four submissions specifically relating to this ward.</p> <p>Three respondents opposed the inclusion of Trinity Close and Warwick Road in Banbury Hardwick ward, proposing that they be included in Banbury Ruscote instead. In order to accommodate these areas while maintaining a good level of electoral equality we have also modified the southern boundary of the ward. The boundary will now run behind the houses on the north side of Broughton Road, rather than the middle of the road. The ward boundary will now follow the county division boundary in this area.</p> <p>Another respondent proposed including the Longelandes Way estate in Banbury Hardwick or Banbury Ruscote wards rather than in Banbury Cross &amp; Neithrop ward. Making this modification would necessitate a series of consequential changes to the wards across Banbury. We do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify these modifications.</p> <p>With the exception of the modifications above we confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
-------------------------------	----------	-----------	--	--

## Bicester

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2019	Description	Detail
<b>Bicester East</b>	3	-8%	The town centre, as far south as Church Street/Causeway, and the residential areas north of the centre extending to the parish boundary with Launton.	We received one submission specifically relating to this ward. The respondent proposed extending the ward south to the railway line. We have been unable to implement this modification as to do so would involve the creation of a parish ward with no electors. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Bicester North &amp; Caversfield</b>	3	-7%	The parish of Caversfield and the residential areas either side of Banbury Road, stretching to the railway line in the south and Buckingham Road to the east.	We received nine submissions specifically relating to this ward. All respondents proposed including the parish of Caversfield in the ward name. We have therefore amended the name of the ward from Bicester North to Bicester North & Caversfield. We received no comments on the ward boundaries. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Bicester South &amp; Ambrosden</b>	3	4%	The south of Bicester town centre, including Bicester Village, Langford Village, the new development south of Middleton Stoney Road, and Ambrosden.	We received one submission specifically relating to this ward. The respondent proposed including the parish of Ambrosden in the ward name. We have therefore amended the name of the ward from Bicester South to Bicester South & Ambrosden. We received no comments on this ward's boundaries. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Bicester West</b>	3	-4%	The residential area bounded by the railway line to the north, Queens Avenue/Field Street to the east, Middleton Stoney Road to the south and the parish boundary with Bucknell to the west.	We received no submissions specifically relating to this ward. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.

## Rural Cherwell, including Kidlington

Ward name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
<b>Adderbury, Bloxham &amp; Bodicote</b>	3	1%	This ward comprises the parishes of Adderbury, Bloxham, Bodicote and Milton.	We received four submissions specifically relating to this ward. One supported our proposed ward. Three other respondents opposed the ward, proposing instead a ward consisting of the parishes of Bloxham, Bodicote, Hook Norton, Wigginton and South Newington. Under this proposal, Adderbury parish would be included in Deddington ward. We consider that our original recommendations provide a better reflection of community links and a better balance of the statutory criteria. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Cropredy, Sibfords &amp; Wroxton</b>	3	-9%	This ward comprises the parishes of Bourton, Broughton, Claydon with Clattercot, Cropredy, Drayton, Epwell, Hanwell, Horley, Hornton, Mollington, North Newington, Prescote, Shenington with Alkerton, Shutford, Sibford Ferris, Sibford Gower, Swalcliffe, Tadmarton, Wardington and Wroxton.	We received one submission specifically relating to this ward, which was supportive of our draft recommendations. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Deddington</b>	3	0%	This ward comprises the parishes of Barford St John & St Michael, Deddington, Duns Tew, Fritwell, Hook Norton,	We received five submissions specifically relating to this ward. Two respondents to our consultation commented that the parishes of Middle Aston and Steeple Aston should be transferred from Deddington ward to Fringford & Heyfords

			Middle Aston, Milcombe, North Aston, Somerton, Souldern, South Newington, Steeple Aston and Wigginton.	<p>ward. This modification would result in the Deddington ward having 12% fewer electors than the district average by 2020. We did not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.</p> <p>Three respondents proposed including the parish of Adderbury in this ward rather than in our Adderbury, Bloxham &amp; Bodicote ward. We consider that our original recommendations provide a better reflection of community links and a better balance of the statutory criteria. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Fringford &amp; Heyfords</b>	3	-7%	This ward comprises the parishes of Ardley, Bucknell, Chesterton, Cottisford, Finmere, Fringford, Godington, Hardwick with Tusmore, Hethe, Kirtlington, Lower Heyford, Middleton Stoney, Mixbury, Newton Purcell with Shelswell, Stoke Lyne, Stratton Audley and Upper Heyford.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this ward. One respondent commented that they considered the ward too large geographically to be effective. Two others proposed including the parishes of Middle Aston and Steeple Aston in this ward rather than in Deddington. This would leave Deddington with 12% fewer electors than the district average by 2020. We did not consider adequate evidence was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.</p> <p>We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Kidlington East</b>	3	4%	This ward comprises the north-west of Kidlington town, with High Street forming its northern boundary, and the parish of Gosford & Water Eaton.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this ward. Both proposed an alternative boundary between this ward and Kidlington West. We consider that the alternative boundary better reflects community identity in this area and so we have modified the boundary between the two wards to run north of Lane Close and Fernhill Close instead of north of Brandon Close and Calves Close. With the exception of this modification we confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>

<b>Kidlington West</b>	3	-1%	This ward comprises the south-east of Kidlington town, with High Street forming its southern boundary, and the parishes of Begbroke and Yarnton.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this ward. Both proposed an alternative boundary between this ward and Kidlington East. We consider that the alternative boundary better reflects community identity in this area and so we have modified the boundary between the two wards to run north of Lane Close and Fernhill Close instead of north of Brandon Close and Calves Close.</p> <p>One respondent proposed including the parish of Shipton-on-Cherwell &amp; Thrupp in this ward instead of our Launton &amp; Otmoor ward. This modification would result in the Launton &amp; Otmoor ward having 12% fewer electors than the district average by 2020. We did not consider persuasive evidence was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.</p> <p>With the exception of the modification of the boundary with Kidlington East, we confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Launton &amp; Otmoor</b>	3	-8%	This ward comprises the parishes of Arncott, Blackthorn, Bletchingdon, Charlton-on-Otmoor, Fencott & Murcott, Hampton Gay & Poyle, Horton-cum-Studley, Islip, Launton, Merton, Noke, Oddington, Piddington, Shipton -on-Cherwell & Thrupp, Wendlebury and Weston-on-the-Green.	<p>We received two submissions specifically relating to this ward. One respondent commented that they considered the ward too large geographically to be effective and another proposed removing the parish of Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp. This would leave the Launton &amp; Otmoor ward with 12% fewer electors than the district average by 2020. We did not consider persuasive evidence was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality. We therefore confirm this ward as final.</p>

## Conclusions

26 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2020 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2020
Number of councillors	48	48
Number of electoral wards	16	16
Average number of electors per councillor	2,284	2,580
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	5	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

### **Final recommendation**

Cherwell District Council should comprise 48 councillors serving 16 three-member wards. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Cherwell. You can also view our final recommendations for Cherwell on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## Parish electoral arrangements

27 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 wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

28 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Cherwell District 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.

29 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Banbury and Bicester parishes. While our draft recommendations also provided revised parish electoral arrangements for Kidlington, the change to ward boundaries made for our final recommendations means that new arrangements are no longer required.

30 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Banbury parish.

**Final recommendation**

Banbury Parish Council should comprise 22 councillors, as at present, representing 12 wards: Calthorpe North (returning one member), Calthorpe South (returning two members), Easington North (returning one member), Easington South (returning two members), Grimsbury (returning three members), Hardwick East (returning one member), Hardwick West (returning four members), Neithrop North (returning one member), Neithrop South (returning one member), Park Road (returning one member), Ruscote (returning four members) and Town Centre (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

31 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bicester parish.

**Final recommendation**

Bicester Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: East (returning four members), North (returning four members), South (returning three members) and West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

32 We have now completed our review of Cherwell District Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2016.

#### Equalities

33 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Cherwell District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Adderbury, Bloxham & Bodicote	3	6,956	2,319	2%	7,839	2,613	1%
2	Banbury Calthorpe & Easington	3	6,757	2,252	-1%	8,183	2,728	6%
3	Banbury Cross & Neithrop	3	7,681	2,560	12%	8,372	2,791	8%
4	Banbury Grimsbury & Hightown	3	7,825	2,608	14%	8,248	2,749	7%
5	Banbury Hardwick	3	6,309	2,103	-8%	8,058	2,686	4%
6	Banbury Ruscote	3	7,012	2,337	2%	8,401	2,800	9%
7	Bicester East	3	6,644	2,215	-3%	7,147	2,382	-8%
8	Bicester North & Caversfield	3	6,020	2,007	-12%	7,167	2,389	-7%
9	Bicester South & Ambrosden	3	6,159	2,053	-10%	8,032	2,677	4%
10	Bicester West	3	7,148	2,383	4%	7,432	2,477	-4%
11	Cropredy, Sibfords & Wroxton	3	6,686	2,229	-2%	7,081	2,360	-9%
12	Deddington	3	7,323	2,441	7%	7,738	2,579	0%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cherwell District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
13	Fringford & Heyfords	3	5,893	1,964	-14%	7,196	2,399	-7%
14	Kidlington East	3	7,704	2,568	12%	8,083	2,694	4%
15	Kidlington West	3	7,376	2,459	8%	7,700	2,567	-1%
16	Launton & Otmoor	3	6,156	2,052	-10%	7,158	2,386	-8%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>109,649</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>123,835</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,284</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,580</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cherwell District Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward 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.

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/oxfordshire/cherwell-fer](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/oxfordshire/cherwell-fer)

### Local authority

- Cherwell District Council

### County Council

- Oxfordshire County Council

### Political parties

- Banbury Labour Party
- North Oxfordshire Conservative Association

### Councillors

- Councillor A. Beere (Cherwell District Council)
- Councillor M. Cherry (Cherwell District Council) – two submissions
- Councillor C. Heath (Cherwell District Council)
- Town Councillor S. Kilsby (Banbury Town Council)
- Councillor J. Macnamara (Cherwell District Council)
- Councillor C. Robins (Kidlington Parish Council)
- Parish Councillor R. Shipway (Caversfield Parish Council)

### Parish councils

- Banbury Town Council
- Bloxham Parish Council
- Bodicote Parish Council
- Caversfield Parish Council
- Hanwell Parish Council
- Kidlington Parish Council
- Middle Aston Parish Meeting
- Middleton Stoney Parish Council
- Milcombe Parish Council
- Oddington Parish Meeting
- Steeple Aston Parish Council

### Residents

- Ten local residents

## Appendix C

### Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or 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