

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	9
North Leicester	9
West Leicester	10
Central Leicester	11
East Leicester	12
South Leicester	13
Conclusions	14
3 What happens next?	15
4 Mapping	17
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Leicester City Council	19
B Glossary and abbreviations	21



## Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We have conducted an electoral review of Leicester City 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 June 2013.

This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
4 June 2013	Consultation on council size
3 September 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
11 November 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
11 March 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
20 May 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 54 members, comprising a pattern of six two-member wards and 14 three-member wards. The draft recommendations were based on proposals made by the Leicester City Labour Party. Having regard to localised evidence and our statutory considerations, we modified those proposals in some areas, for example, in the South Highfields area. Our draft recommendations sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

The Commission received 11 submissions during the consultation on council size. The Council proposed no change to the current council size of 54 members. The City of Leicester Conservative Association proposed a reduction in council size to 42 members. The remaining submissions were from local residents. One submission supported retaining the existing council size of 54, the remainder supported a reduction.

When we invited proposals for warding patterns, we received 11 submissions including city-wide warding patterns from the City of Leicester Conservative Association, Leicester City Labour Party and Leicester City Liberal Democrats. Three responses made suggestions about particular parts of the city. Two submissions were expressions of support for the Leicester City Labour Party's proposal. Two

submissions commented solely on council size, with proposals for a reduction in the number of councillors.

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 150 submissions from local residents, 13 submissions from local organisations, two from political groups, one from a Leicester ward councillor and a submission from Keith Vaz MP (Leicester East). All submissions made at each stage of the review can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

Leicester City Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. The forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 1% between 2012 and 2019. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used them as the basis of our final recommendations.

### General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we considered that there was insufficient evidence to persuade us to move away from our recommendation that the Council should have 54 ward councillors. However, we did find sufficient evidence to persuade us to move away from our draft recommendations for ward boundaries in the South Leicester area. We also received proposals to amend ward names in a number of areas and, having considered this evidence, have changed one of our proposed ward names as part of our final recommendations.

Our final recommendations for Leicester are that the Council should have 54 members, with nine two-member wards and 12 three-member wards. No ward would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019.

### What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Leicester City Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Leicester City Council in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our final recommendations for Leicester on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review was conducted following our decision to review Leicester City Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 Submissions received from Leicester City Council and others during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Leicester City Council*, which were published on 11 March 2014. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 20 May 2014.

## What is an electoral review?

3 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.

4 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 have we conducted a review in Leicester?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on December 2011 electorate data, 36% of the Council's 22 wards had electoral variances greater than +/- 10%. The two outliers Abbey and Spinney Hills wards currently have 20% fewer and 28% more electors than the city average, respectively.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. Your ward name may also change.

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

7 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.

---

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

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Alison Lowton  
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 final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Leicester City Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Leicester 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
- 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

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

11 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. In all our reviews 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. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

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

### Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Leicester City Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. The Council proposed no change to the current council size of 54 councillors. The City of Leicester Conservative Association (‘Leicester Conservatives’) proposed a reduction in council size to 42 councillors. We received nine submissions during our consultation on council size from local residents. One submission supported retaining the existing council size of 54; the remainder supported a reduction.

---

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

14 We received 11 submissions during the consultation on warding arrangements, including city-wide warding patterns from the Leicester Conservatives, Leicester City Labour Party ('Leicester Labour') and Leicester City Liberal Democrats ('Leicester Liberal Democrats'). Three responses made suggestions about particular parts of the city. Two submissions expressed support for the Leicester Labour proposal. Two submissions commented solely on council size, with proposals for a reduction in the number of councillors. During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 150 submissions from local residents 13 submissions from local organisations, two from political groups, one from a Leicester ward councillor and a submission from Keith Vaz MP (Leicester East). All of the submissions may be inspected by appointment at our offices. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

15 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an overall increase in the electorate of approximately 1% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account future developments across the city.

16 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

17 In addition to the elected mayor, the Council currently has 54 ward councillors elected from 22 city wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently proposed that the current council size be retained. In support of its proposal, the Council said that retaining this council size would ensure that the existing governance arrangements would continue to be 'resilient in terms of the ability to take on board changes including new responsibilities'. The Council also said that the existing council size ensured diverse representation in the decision-making process. It added that a council size of 54 would ensure that there was 'sufficient capacity to effectively undertake the representational role of councillors at the local ward level and particularly in relation to casework and enquiries'. In particular, the Council argued that the high levels of deprivation, combined with the national economic climate, public sector cuts and welfare reforms, has created a 'corresponding rise in terms of constituent enquiries and caseloads'.

18 Leicester Conservatives proposed a council size of 42 councillors. They stated that the adoption of the elected mayorality had changed the role of councillors. The proposal was supported by the same information presented by the Council. However, they stated that there was 'an over-reliance on members in scrutiny... and that there is good evidence that the change to the mayoral system has impacted on the workload of local councillors'. The Leicester Conservatives refuted the claim made by the Council that technology had not created a more efficient way of dealing with casework.

19 Whilst we took the view that Leicester Conservatives' proposal was supported by some rationale, we considered that their proposal did not demonstrate how the Council would be structured or suggest how it would operate with 12 fewer councillors.

20 Having considered these proposals, we decided to consult on the proposal to retain a council size of 54. We received nine submissions in response to our consultation. These were all from local residents: one submission supported retaining the existing council size of 54; two supported a reduction in council size to 43 members; three supported a reduction in council size to half the number of councillors, i.e. to 27; two did not comment specifically on council size; and one representation supported a council size of 22.

21 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. Although the submissions received provided mixed support for a council size of 54, we did not receive persuasive evidence for any other council size, nor was any evidence submitted to contradict the rationale presented by the Council. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 54 as the basis of this electoral review and invited proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

22 During consultation on warding patterns we received three submissions which commented on council size. Two were from local residents who supported a reduction in council size but did not propose an alternative. The other was from the Leicester Conservatives whose proposed warding pattern would result in a council size of 53. We investigated whether a warding pattern based on 53 rather than 54 would better meet our statutory criteria. We considered that a warding pattern based on 54 members resulted in a better allocation of members across the city and would better reflect those criteria. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Leicester were based on a council size of 54.

23 We did not receive any further evidence during the consultation on our draft recommendations and have therefore based our final recommendations on a council size of 54 ward councillors.

## Electoral fairness

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The city average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the city (235,920 in 2012 and 238,084 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 54 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 4,369 in 2012 and 4,409 by 2019.

25 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the city by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Leicester.

## General analysis

26 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 150 submissions from local residents 13 submissions from local organisations, two from political groups, one from a local councillor and a submission from Keith Vaz MP (Leicester East).

27 Mr Vaz expressed his support for our draft recommendations in full. One resident said that 'I think [the draft recommendations] give a good distribution of electors to councillors and reflect the geographical and social realities of the city'.

28 The proposals which generated the most submissions were in the South Leicester area. In particular, 123 local residents objected to our draft recommendations for Aylestone & Eyres Monsell and Saffron & Aylestone Park wards. Of six residents who did support those draft recommendations, one proposed a minor modification to a ward boundary. Five Saffron community project and facility managers supported the draft recommendations.

29 There were also seven objections to our draft recommendation for the Allandale Road and Francis Street area.

30 The Leicester Conservatives whilst objecting to the overall approach to the draft recommendations submitted counterproposals for the Aylestone and Eyres Monsell area, the west Leicester area and the Evington and Uppingham Road area.

31 The Leicester Liberal Democrats, whilst supporting the draft recommendations in a number of areas, put forward alternative proposals in some parts of the city. Their representation to us focussed on the Aylestone area, the New Parks area and the area to the north-east of the city centre.

32 The Leicester Conservatives' and the Leicester Liberal Democrats' representations echoed the large volume of responses from the Aylestone area.

33 In the west, east and north-east of the city, we were not persuaded that their counterproposals would provide a better reflection of the city's communities than would the draft recommendations. Some of our recommended boundaries were supported in one set of counterproposals, some in neither set. Whilst we could see merit in some of the proposed amendments, accepting them would, because of our need to secure good electoral equality, have adverse consequences for the representation of communities nearby, or in some cases, a considerable distance away.

34 The Leicester Conservatives invited us to consider data arising from the 2011 Census alongside the evidence it had provided in support of its counterproposals. Whilst we have considered the census data, we are not persuaded that the classifications of demographic and household characteristics for census output areas in themselves demonstrate community identity or that there are necessarily communal interactions between people sharing one or more similar characteristics. The census output maps to which the Conservative Association drew our attention do not therefore provide conclusive evidence, but we have considered, in addition, the arguments which the Conservative Association has directly presented in its response to the draft recommendations.

35 To the west and north-east of the city centre, we have therefore adopted as final, the boundaries put forward in our draft recommendations.

36 We received a number of proposals for alternative ward names. The Leicester Liberal Democrats said that if we were minded not to change our proposed boundaries, we should nevertheless adopt different names for a number of wards. A local resident also proposed alternative names for some wards contained in our draft recommendations. We considered that the names proposed represent, in two cases, a better reflection of communities than the names we proposed in our draft recommendations. We therefore propose to adopt the names of Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields and North Evington as part of our final recommendations.

37 Our final recommendations would result in nine two-member wards and 12 three-member wards. We consider our recommendations provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Leicester.

## Electoral arrangements

38 This section of the report details the representations on the draft recommendations we received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Leicester. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- North Leicester (pages 9–10)
- West Leicester (pages 10–11)
- Central Leicester (pages 11–12)
- East Leicester (pages 12–13)
- South Leicester (page 13–14)

39 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 19–20 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### North Leicester

40 The northern part of Leicester City is covered by the Abbey, Beaumont Leys, Belgrave, Latimer and Rushey Mead wards.

41 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Abbey, Beaumont Leys, Belgrave and Rushey Mead wards and a two-member Troon ward.

42 The Leicester Liberal Democrats commented that in our draft recommendations, the English Martyrs' Catholic School buildings would be separated from one of the school's playing fields by the Beaumont Leys ward boundary. We have accepted this point and have decided to include the whole of the school in the Beaumont Leys ward.

43 We also received a proposal from a local resident to modify our Beaumont Leys ward by excluding from it the area to the south of Groby Road. The respondent argued that a long-standing proposal for housing in the ward would result in an increase in its electorate. However, we are required to consider how the number of

electors will change in the period of five years from the publication of our final recommendations and have accepted for the purposes of the review the Council's electorate forecasts. As we stated in paragraph 15, those forecasts have taken into account development which may be expected to take place in that five-year period.

44 The respondent's proposal would mean that in 2019, Beaumont Leys ward would have 13% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the city. We were not persuaded that there is sufficient justification for this level of electoral inequality and therefore are not adopting the proposal as part of our final recommendations.

45 The local resident also proposed that the area to the east of Nicklaus Road, which we proposed to include in our Troon ward, should be included in the Rushey Mead ward. This proposal would result in 18% fewer and 15% more electors per councillor than the average for the city in those wards, respectively. We were not persuaded that there is sufficient justification for these levels of electoral inequality.

46 The Leicester Liberal Democrats proposed that should we confirm the boundaries of our Belgrave and Rushey Mead wards, we should name them Latimer & Belgrave West and Rushey Mead & Belgrave East, respectively. Having regard to the nature of the area and locations of community and other facilities bearing those names, we have concluded that the names Belgrave and Rushey Mead are appropriate for those wards. The Leicester Liberal Democrats and a local resident suggested that our Troon ward be named Northfields. We considered that the Northfields area lies at the southern extremity of our proposed Troon ward and is remote from the northern parts of it and would be an inappropriate name for the whole ward. We are therefore proposing no change to our ward names in this area.

47 We therefore confirm our proposed three-member Abbey, Beaumont Leys, Belgrave and Rushey Mead wards and two-member Troon ward as part of our final recommendations. These wards are forecast to have 2% fewer, 5% fewer, 2% fewer, 3% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019, respectively.

## West Leicester

48 The western part of Leicester City is covered by the Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields, Fosse, New Parks and Western Park wards.

49 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Braunstone & Rowley Fields and Western wards, and a two-member Fosse ward.

50 We received no objection to the boundaries of our proposed Braunstone & Rowley Fields ward. A local resident did, however, propose that we retain the existing ward name of Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields, pointing out that the parished area of Braunstone lies adjacent to our proposed ward in the neighbouring district of Blaby. For the purposes of clarity, we have adopted the name Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields as part of our final recommendations.

51 The local resident also proposed that Western ward be named Newton, drawing on a former ward name. Leicester Liberal Democrats proposed that, should we confirm as final the boundaries of our proposed Western ward, we name it Western Park. However, we note that Western Park is the name by which one particular area

of the proposed ward is identified. We considered that the name Western reflects the full extent of the ward, embracing as it does the Braunstone Frith community which extends up to the city boundary and which is acknowledged as having an identity separate from that of the New Parks and Western Park communities.

52 Our final recommendations for west Leicester are, therefore, for three-member Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields and Western wards and a two-member Fosse ward having 6% more, 7% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019 respectively.

## Central Leicester

53 The central part of Leicester is covered by the Castle, Spinney Hills, Stoneygate and Westcotes wards.

54 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Castle and Stoneygate wards and two-member Spinney Hills, Westcotes and Wycliffe wards.

55 The Castle ward includes the city's commercial centre, the main campuses of its two universities and the Leicester Royal Infirmary. The principal residential areas of this ward are Clarendon Park, the western part of the South Highfields district and the Walnut Street area to the south and west of the Royal Infirmary. Electorate forecasts indicate that if unchanged, this ward would have 20% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019.

56 As part of our draft recommendations, we proposed that the western part of the South Highfields area be included in a Stoneygate ward. The Highfields Association of Residents and Tenants and one resident supported this aspect of our draft recommendations, regarding it as reuniting the Highfields community in one ward.

57 The management council of the Islamic Centre, Leicester proposed, however, that the boundary of Stoneygate ward should follow the centre of Conduit Street and that properties to the north side of Conduit Street remain in the Castle ward. The effect of this proposal would be that the area to the north of Conduit Street would be separated from the rest of Castle ward by the railway, station and associated land, and by London Road. We do not consider that this would reflect community identity and therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for this area.

58 We also proposed that the Walnut Street area described above be included in a Saffron ward. The St Andrews Tenants' Association opposed this aspect of our draft recommendations but suggested that, should we be unable to maintain current ward boundaries, Walnut Street or Grasmere Street and Thirlmere Street would provide better ward boundaries than Havelock Street. We have considered these alternatives and concluded that we are unable to maintain the current ward boundary, having regard to electoral equality in the Castle and adjacent wards. We also considered that inclusion of the whole of the Walnut Street area in a single ward to be preferable to its subdivision.

59 A local resident proposed that our Castle ward be named De Montfort, commenting that our proposed name is outmoded. We consider, however, that our proposals do not significantly alter the existing Castle ward and that retention of the

existing ward name would provide continuity and clarity for most electors in the area. We therefore confirm as final our draft recommendation for the Castle ward.

60 Seven residents and business proprietors in the Allandale Road and Francis Street area opposed our inclusion of their area in Stoneygate ward. They said that their area is more closely associated with the Knighton area and has received support from Knighton community meetings but not from Stoneygate community meetings.

61 We were persuaded by the representations made to us to modify the boundaries of our proposed Knighton and Stoneygate wards by the inclusion of Allandale Road and Francis Street in Knighton ward.

62 A local resident proposed that our Stoneygate ward be named either Evington Valley or Devana, the latter being a Roman road which ran through the area. We observed that the course of the Roman road, the Evington Brook and Evington Valley Road extend beyond the boundaries of our proposed ward. Furthermore, our draft recommendations would not change substantially the extent of the current Stoneygate ward. We therefore considered that retention of the existing ward names would provide continuity and clarity for most people in the area.

63 Our final recommendations for central Leicester are, therefore, for three-member Castle and Stoneygate wards and two-member Spinney Hills, Westcotes and Wycliffe wards. These wards would have 6% fewer, 2% more, 4% more, 1% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019, respectively.

## East Leicester

64 The eastern part of the city is covered by the Charnwood, Coleman, Evington, Humberstone & Hamilton and Thurncourt wards.

65 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Evington, Green Lane and Humberstone & Hamilton wards and a two-member Thurncourt ward. We received no objections to our Humberstone & Hamilton and Thurncourt wards and confirm our draft recommendations as final.

66 We considered that the counterproposals received for this area presented insufficient evidence of community identity to persuade us to move away from our draft recommendations. Furthermore, we consider that doing so would adversely affect our ability to reflect community identities in adjacent wards.

67 The Leicester Liberal Democrats proposed that, were we minded to confirm the boundaries of our Green Lane ward, the ward be named North Evington, whilst a local resident suggested it be called West Humberstone. We were not persuaded that there is sufficient evidence for the latter suggestion but we did consider that the name North Evington, which appears in the west and eastern parts of the ward, reflects the extent of our proposed ward to a greater degree than does Green Lane.

68 Our final recommendations for East Leicester are, therefore, for three-member Evington, Humberstone & Hamilton and North Evington wards and a two-member Thurncourt ward. These wards are forecast to have 2% fewer, 7% fewer, 4% fewer

and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019, respectively.

## South Leicester

69 The southern part of the city is covered by the Aylestone, Eyres Monsell, Freeman and Knighton wards. These wards are forecast to have good levels of electoral equality in 2019. Despite this, we contemplated changes to these wards as part of our need to address electoral inequality throughout the city as a whole.

70 In our draft recommendations, we proposed three-member Aylestone & Eyres Monsell, Knighton and Saffron & Aylestone Park wards. These proposals, more than any others, attracted the greatest amount of responses to our consultation.

71 One hundred and twenty three local residents objected to our draft recommendations for Aylestone & Eyres Monsell and Saffron & Aylestone Park. Many expressed the view that the current Aylestone ward should not be changed but did not add substantive evidence of community identity to support that view. Others argued that Aylestone village and Aylestone Park, linked in the existing Aylestone ward, form a coherent community which would be split by our draft recommendations. To these arguments were added the view that our draft recommendations would combine communities that have little interaction. Amongst six residents who did support those draft recommendations, were those who disagreed with the view that Aylestone village and Aylestone Park form a single community. Five local organisations supported this view and identified Eyres Monsell and Saffron as separate communities. Five managers of local organisations and facilities supported the draft recommendations, stating that they would combine the community which spans Saffron Lane.

72 The Leicester Conservatives, the Leicester Liberal Democrats and five organisations local to Aylestone each proposed that our Aylestone & Eyres Monsell and Saffron & Aylestone Park wards be divided into three two-member wards, broadly reflecting current boundaries. However, they differed on the ward boundaries which would lie to the south of the A563. The Leicester Conservatives argued that the present ward boundaries in this area be retained whilst the Leicester Liberal Democrats proposed that the area around Lutterworth Road/Gilmorton Avenue be combined with Eyres Monsell whilst Stonesby Avenue should form a boundary between Eyres Monsell and Saffron wards. Several other objectors to our draft recommendations expressed preferences for dividing the area into three wards but did not specify boundaries.

73 We were persuaded by the evidence presented that the balance of community interests would be more accurately reflected in a two-member warding pattern. We have therefore decided to modify our draft recommendations and, as part of our final recommendations, propose two-member Aylestone, Eyres Monsell and Saffron wards. We considered that Stonesby Avenue would form a less distinct boundary than does the A563 and have therefore adopted the current ward boundaries for Eyres Monsell ward. The ward boundaries can be seen on the large map which accompanies this report.

74 We have moved away from our draft recommendation for Knighton ward in accepting the arguments put forward in relation to Allandale Road and Francis Street,

described in paragraph 61 above. We received no other objections to the boundary of our proposed Knighton ward

75 Our final recommendations for south Leicester are therefore for two-member Aylestone, Eyres Monsell and Saffron wards and a three-member Knighton ward. These wards are forecast to have 2% more, 3% fewer, 2% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the average for the city by 2019, respectively.

### Conclusions

76 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2019 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2019
Number of councillors	54	54
Number of electoral wards/divisions	21	21
Average number of electors per councillor	4,369	4,409
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	0	0
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**  
 Leicester City Council should comprise 54 councillors serving 21 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### 3 What happens next?

77 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Leicester. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Leicester City Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

78 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.



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Leicester

79 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Leicester City Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Leicester City Council.

You can also view our final recommendations for Leicester on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>



## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Leicester City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Abbey	3	12,753	4,251	-3%	12,936	4,312	-2%
2	Aylestone	2	8,739	4,370	0%	9,014	4,507	2%
3	Beaumont Leys	3	12,483	4,161	-5%	12,551	4,184	-5%
4	Belgrave	3	12,817	4,272	-2%	12,934	4,311	-2%
5	Braunstone Park & Rowley Fields	3	13,839	4,613	6%	13,980	4,660	6%
6	Castle	3	12,423	4,141	-5%	12,452	4,151	-6%
7	Evington	3	12,832	4,277	-2%	12,986	4,329	-2%
8	Eyres Monsell	2	8,281	4,141	-5%	8,516	4,258	-3%
9	Fosse	2	9,107	4,554	4%	9,348	4,674	6%
10	Humberstone & Hamilton	3	12,562	4,187	-4%	12,334	4,111	-7%
11	Knighton	3	13,139	4,380	0%	13,574	4,525	3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Leicester City Council**

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12 North Evington	3	13,092	4,364	0%	12,653	4,218	-4%
13 Rushey Mead	3	13,365	4,455	2%	13,649	4,550	3%
14 Saffron	2	9,160	4,580	5%	8,997	4,499	2%
15 Spinney Hills	2	9,159	4,580	5%	9,212	4,606	4%
16 Stoneygate	3	13,179	4,393	1%	13,540	4,513	2%
17 Thurncourt	2	8,078	4,039	-8%	8,332	4,166	-6%
18 Troon	2	8,836	4,418	1%	8,901	4,451	1%
19 Westcotes	2	9,065	4,533	4%	8,730	4,365	-1%
20 Western	3	13,852	4,617	6%	14,208	4,736	7%
21 Wycliffe	2	9,159	4,580	5%	9,237	4,619	5%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>235,920</b>			<b>238,084</b>		
<b>Averages</b>			<b>4,369</b>			<b>4,409</b>	

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Leicester City Council.

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

## Appendix B

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

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

