

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Summary | 1 |
| 1 Introduction | 3 |
| 2 Analysis and final recommendations | 5 |
| Submissions received | 6 |
| Electorate figures | 6 |
| Council size | 6 |
| Electoral fairness | 7 |
| General analysis | 7 |
| Electoral arrangements | 9 |
| Central Milton Keynes | 9 |
| Bletchley | 11 |
| East Milton Keynes | 13 |
| North Milton Keynes | 14 |
| West Milton Keynes | 16 |
| Conclusions | 18 |
| Parish electoral arrangements | 18 |
| 3 What happens next? | 23 |
| 4 Mapping | 24 |
| Appendices | |
| A Table A1: Final recommendations for Milton Keynes Council | 25 |
| B Glossary and abbreviations | 27 |

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Milton Keynes 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 February 2012.

This review was conducted in five stages:

| Stage starts | Description |
|---------------------|---|
| 8 May 2012 | Consultation on council size |
| 24 July 2012 | Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE |
| 16 October 2012 | LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations |
| 22 January 2013 | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on recommendations |
| 19 March 2013 | Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations |

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 57 members, comprising a pattern of 19 three-member wards. The draft recommendations were broadly based on a combination of proposals by Milton Keynes Council the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council. In some areas we moved away from these proposals in order to better reflect the statutory criteria. The draft recommendations would provide good levels of electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in Milton Keynes.

Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received 127 submissions. Milton Keynes Labour Party, West Bletchley Labour Party and West Bletchley Parish Council proposed warding arrangements on a uniform pattern of 19 three-member wards. A scheme put forward by Iain Stewart MP (Milton Keynes South) proposed borough-wide warding arrangements based on a mixed pattern of single- two- and three-member wards. We also received submissions from the Liberal Democrat Group, 97 local residents, eight councillors, 17 parish and town councils and one local organisation. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

Milton Keynes Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 11.5% over this period.

We had concerns that the Council's figures overestimated the growth in larger developments over the five-year period. Therefore, we requested more information regarding development across the borough. In response, the Council submitted revised electorate growth figures of 6.8% across this period. This took account of our concerns and we therefore agreed to the Council's revised methodology which provided a more realistic growth forecast across the largest development areas.

Prior to the publication of our draft recommendations we toured the area to assess the development sites. The Council also provided an update to its forecast based on the latest information available. In light of this the Commission and the Council agreed to the revised projected electorate figure of 6.7% growth across the borough by 2018.

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 the consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations for Milton Keynes are that the Council should have 57 members, with 19 three-member wards. All wards would have electoral variances of less than 10% by 2018.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Milton Keynes Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Milton Keynes Council, in 2014. 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

You can also view our final recommendations for Milton Keynes Council 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 is being conducted following our decision to review Milton Keynes Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submissions received from Milton Keynes Council ('the Council') and Milton Keynes Liberal Democrat Group informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Milton Keynes*, which were published on 22 January 2013. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 18 March 2013.

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 legislation¹ 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

Why are we conducting a review in Milton Keynes

5 We decided to conduct this review because based on January 2011 electorate figures, 39% of its wards currently exceed the 10% variance threshold and one ward has an electoral variance of more than 30% from the average. The largest outlier is the two-member Middleton ward which has 40% more electors than average for Milton Keynes.

How will our recommendations affect you?

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

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Milton Keynes.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Milton Keynes Council 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 2009² 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 Milton Keynes Council or the external boundaries or names of parish or town councils, 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 are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

13 Under the 2009 Act, where a council elects by thirds or halves (as opposed to the whole council being elected every four years), there is a presumption that the authority will have a uniform pattern of three-member and two-member wards respectively. We will only move away from this presumption where we receive compelling evidence to do so and where it can be demonstrated that an alternative warding pattern will better reflect our statutory criteria. Our starting point for this review was that Milton Keynes Council should have a uniform pattern of three-member wards given its current electoral cycle, but we could depart from this

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

presumption if we received strong evidence in support of two-member or single-member wards.

Submissions received

14 Prior to and during the initial stages of the review, members and officers of the Local Government Boundary Commission visited Milton Keynes Council and met with officers, members and parish councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 120 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns and 127 during the consultation on our draft recommendations, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of Milton Keynes Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

15 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. We have also been assisted by officers at Milton Keynes Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate figures

16 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 11.5% over this period.

17 We had concerns over the Council's projected electorate forecast. We were concerned at the level of growth projected in a number of larger developments across the borough. In response, the Council submitted revised electorate growth figures of 6.8% across this period. We agreed to the Council's revised methodology which provided a more realistic growth forecast across the largest development areas.

18 Prior to the publication of our draft recommendations, we toured the area to assess progress in the development sites and noted that some developments appeared to be progressing faster than the Council had calculated in its forecasts. The Council agreed that some development had progressed quicker than the anticipated rate. However, it also provided updates on other developments which were now unlikely to take place. Based on this latest information, we agreed with the Council's further revised projections for electorate growth of 6.7% across the borough by 2018.

Council size

19 During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with the Council's Group Leaders. The Council subsequently provided a cross-party draft proposal for a council size of 57, an increase of six members from the current 51. We requested further information relating to this proposal. The Council provided a finalised submission on 24 February 2012.

20 Based on the representations received during the preliminary stage, we decided that there was insufficient evidence to recommend a council size of 57 members. We

therefore undertook a six-week period of public consultation on the existing council size of 51 members.

21 During the public consultation on council size, 44 submissions were received. These were from 10 parish and town councils, four borough councillors, two local organisations, one political group, one MP, and 26 local residents. No further submission was received from the Council.

22 Based on the submissions received, we considered that the case for an increase to 57 councillors was finely balanced, but were persuaded by the arguments from the Milton Keynes Liberal Democrat Party, and from Councillor Bint (Middleton ward) and Councillor Brackenbury (Linford South ward). The Council will face additional responsibilities over the next 10 years and will require further resources to develop its infrastructure and strategies to manage an expanding town. We therefore invited representations on warding arrangements based on a 57-member council.

Electoral fairness

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

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we calculate the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (178,504 in 2012 and 190,468 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 57 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 3,132 in 2012 and 3,342 by 2018.

25 Under our final recommendations, all of our proposed 19 wards will have an electoral variance of less than 10% from the average for Milton Keynes by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Milton Keynes.

General analysis

26 Our draft recommendations provided for a 57-member council with a uniform pattern of 19 three-member wards. No ward was forecast to have a variance of more than 10% from the borough average by 2018. The draft recommendations were broadly based on a combination of proposals by the Council and the Milton Keynes Liberal Democrat Group on the Council. Where we proposed modifications, it was to better reflect our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations provided good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in Milton Keynes.

27 We received 127 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations including new electoral schemes from Milton Keynes Labour Party, West Bletchley Labour Party, West Bletchley Parish Council and Iain Stewart MP.

28 Milton Keynes Labour Party proposed alternative warding patterns for Bletchley, Central Milton Keynes and Newport Pagnell. The West Bletchley Labour Party and West Bletchley Parish Council produced a similar scheme relating to the Bletchley area. Mr Stewart produced an alternative warding scheme covering the entirety of Milton Keynes with significant amendments to the draft recommendations in the east of Milton Keynes, Bletchley, Central Milton Keynes and west of Milton Keynes

29 A large number of residents in Old Woughton parish expressed support for the recommendations for the centre of Milton Keynes. Specifically, they supported the proposal that Old Woughton parish be located in the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward with Woughton Community Council being located in the adjoining Woughton & Fishermead ward. We also received submissions from residents in Bletchley who were opposed to the draft recommendations to divide the parish ward of Central Bletchley between the proposed borough wards of Bletchley East and Bletchley Park.

30 In the east of Milton Keynes we received submissions objecting to our proposed Danesborough & Walton ward, which would include the rural village of Wavendon with some of the urban estates in the centre of Milton Keynes. Iain Stewart MP put forward a scheme in this area based on a mixed pattern of single- and three-member wards.

31 In the north of Milton Keynes we received submissions from local residents and parish and town councils. The majority of submissions objected to the uniform pattern of three-member wards for the north of the borough and the proposed Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope and Olney wards.

32 In the west of Milton Keynes we received submissions objecting to the use of a brook as the boundary between the Bletchley area and Shenley Brook End ward. We also received an objection to our proposed Bradwell ward which combines the areas of Bradwell and Two Mile Ash. Iain Stewart put forward a scheme in this area based on a mixed pattern of two- and three-member wards.

33 We have given careful consideration to the submissions received including the alternative warding arrangements put forward by Iain Stewart MP and the Milton Keynes Labour Party. We recognise that both schemes have merit in that they use clearly defined ward boundaries and reflect community identities in parts of the borough. However, on balance we propose to confirm our draft recommendations as final for Milton Keynes. In particular, we were not persuaded that we had received sufficient evidence to depart from the uniform pattern of three-member wards as proposed by Mr Stewart. Given this, it is not possible to accommodate any part of his proposals in our final recommendations. Furthermore, we were not persuaded that his proposed three-member Wavendon & Walton ward would reflect community identities, in that it combined both rural areas in the east of the borough with more urban communities towards the centre of Milton Keynes.

34 We acknowledge that the Milton Keynes Labour Party's proposals provide a fair reflection of the statutory criteria and would provide for a uniform pattern of three-member wards. However, they were largely aimed at dismantling our proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward. We considered there was insufficient evidence produced to warrant a departure from the draft recommendations for this proposed ward particularly given that we have received submissions and evidence in support of

it. We were therefore not persuaded that the Milton Keynes Labour Party had provided sufficient supporting evidence to justify such a radical change in warding pattern.

35 Our final recommendations are for a pattern of 19 three-member wards. We consider our recommendations to provide good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

36 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 25–6) and on the map accompanying this report.

Electoral arrangements

37 This section of the report details our final recommendations for each area of Milton Keynes. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Central Milton Keynes (pages 9–11)
- Bletchley (pages 11–13)
- East Milton Keynes (pages 13–14)
- North Milton Keynes (pages 14–16)
- West Milton Keynes (pages 16–17)

38 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 25–6, and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Central Milton Keynes

39 As part of the draft recommendations, we proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards in the centre of Milton Keynes. These included the three-member wards of Stantonbury, Woughton & Fishermead, Central Milton Keynes and Campbell Park & Old Woughton.

40 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 79 submissions for the centre of Milton Keynes. The majority of submissions were from the Old Woughton area which is included in the proposed ward of Campbell Park & Old Woughton.

41 A total of 67 submissions supported the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward. Respondents argued that the draft recommendations bring together communities along the route of the Grand Union Canal. The ward would join the villages of Simpson, Ashland and Woughton Park in the south with Springfield and Woolstone in the centre and Downhead Park, Downs Barn and Pennyland in the north.

42 The draft recommendations in this area were opposed by eight respondents. These were from the Milton Keynes Labour Party, Iain Stewart MP, two local residents, three parish councils and Councillor Paul Williams (Campbell Park).

43 Mr Stewart specifically objected to the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward on the basis that the areas in the north and south of the

proposed ward have no community ties. He put forward an alternative scheme which would divide the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward between eight new proposed wards which cover the centre and east of the borough.

- 44 We have given careful consideration to Mr Stewart's submission and did not consider there was sufficient evidence to justify departing from the draft recommendations for Campbell Park & Old Woughton and the centre of Milton Keynes. His proposed ward of Wavendon & Walton stretches from the eastern boundary of the borough to Simpson village. We were not persuaded there was sufficient evidence for linking these communities together and note that the residents of Wavendon have also made submissions objecting to any proposal that they be joined in a ward with the urban areas towards the centre of the borough. Furthermore, the proposed ward is contingent on the creation of a single-member ward for the Woburn Sands area, in the south-east for which no evidence was produced. As noted earlier, we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence had been received to support a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards in Milton Keynes.
- 45 Mr Stewart's proposal would place the village of Ashland with Bletchley Park. This would mean significant changes to wards in the Bletchley area and west of Milton Keynes. However, we were not persuaded there was sufficient evidence for joining Ashland village with Bletchley Park in the south or that such a change would reflect community identities. We note in particular that the two areas are divided by the A5 dual carriageway.
- 46 The Milton Keynes Labour Party's submission described Campbell Park & Old Woughton as 'a very long ward' with no community links between the north and south. The Milton Keynes Labour Party put forward an alternative scheme which would divide the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward. The impact of this would require significant changes to the warding pattern in central Milton Keynes and Newport Pagnell.
- 47 Under this alternative scheme, Simpson and Ashland villages would form part of a proposed Woughton ward which would in turn lose the Fishermead estate to their proposed Central Milton Keynes ward. They considered transferring Old Woughton parish to their proposed Woughton ward. However, they noted the objections of residents in the previous consultation on warding arrangements, who strongly opposed proposals to include the Woughton area with Old Woughton. Instead, they proposed that the parish wards of Woughton on the Green South, Woughton on the Green North and Woughton Park be contained in a three-member Monkston ward.
- 48 The Milton Keynes Labour Party also proposed that the Fishermead and Springfield estates be added with the town centre and Oldbrook in a three-member Central Milton Keynes ward. The Woolstone area on the other side of the Grand Union Canal would be included in their proposed Broughton ward as they asserted that this area shares community identities and interests with communities to its west rather than towards the centre of Milton Keynes. The remaining estates of Bradwell Common, Conniburrow and Downs Barn, along with Downhead Park, Willen Park North, Willen Park South and the Campbell Park grid square would form a three-member Conniburrow ward.

- 49 In the north of the centre of Milton Keynes, the Milton Keynes Labour Party proposed that the Bolbeck Park and Pennyland areas (in Great Linford Parish) be contained in a three-member Newport Pagnell South ward. They argued that this would divide Great Linford parish between three borough wards rather than six as under the draft recommendations. In addition, it would provide a better reflection of community identity as the Bolbeck and Pennyland areas have no community links with areas in the south of Central Milton Keynes. These amendments would only affect the centre of Milton Keynes, Bletchley and Newport Pagnell with no consequential changes to the east, west and north of Milton Keynes.
- 50 We have carefully considered the evidence received by the Milton Keynes Labour Party and the submissions which objected to the draft recommendations in Central Milton Keynes. We note the Milton Keynes Labour Party's objection to Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward on the grounds of lack of community ties and that it would not provide for effective and convenient local government. However, on balance, we consider that the evidence is not sufficient to depart from the draft recommendations for Campbell Park & Old Woughton (which the Commission itself formulated) and the rest of Central Milton Keynes. In particular, we were not persuaded that the evidence to support this proposal was sufficient to justify such a radical change to the draft recommendations. Furthermore, while noting the unusual shape of the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward, we have received evidence from local residents supporting the proposed ward.
- 51 We acknowledge that this decision is finely balanced but have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. A number of local residents support the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward and the Milton Keynes Liberal Democrats have mostly accepted the draft recommendations for Milton Keynes.
- 52 Under our final recommendations, the three-member wards of Campbell Park & Old Woughton, Central Milton Keynes, Stantonbury and Woughton & Fishermead would have 3% more, equal to, 8% more and 3% more electors per councillor respectively than the average for the borough by 2018. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Bletchley

- 53 In our draft recommendations, we proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards for the Bletchley area. These include the wards of Bletchley West, Bletchley Park and Bletchley East.
- 54 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 12 submissions relating to this area. Seven respondents voiced their objection to the division of the Central Bletchley area between two borough wards. Three submissions objected to the draft recommendations which used a brook as the boundary between Shenley Brook End and Bletchley West wards.
- 55 The main focus of the objections to the draft recommendations was in Central Bletchley. The draft recommendations split the area between the proposed borough wards of Bletchley Park and Bletchley East. The three schemes of the

Milton Keynes Labour Party, West Bletchley Labour Party and West Bletchley Parish Council all proposed to unify the Central Bletchley area in a single borough ward.

- 56 All three schemes put forward evidence that dividing Central Bletchley would undermine the community cohesion that has evolved in the area, particularly that of the Bangladeshi community who are primarily located in Central Bletchley. Under their alternative schemes, Central Bletchley would be contained wholly within a Bletchley East ward (Bletchley South under Milton Keynes Labour Party scheme) along with the Poets, Manor North, Manor South, Eaton North, Eaton North East, Eaton South and Newton Leys areas. The ward would lose the Fenny Stratford area to achieve improved electoral equality.
- 57 The West Bletchley Labour Party provided evidence that the Poets area looks more towards Central Bletchley as it shares historical links and shopping facilities. Further evidence put forward stated that residents in Poets are closely linked with the Scots sports ground over the railway line at the end of Selbourne Avenue.
- 58 All three schemes proposed a Bletchley Park ward which would include the areas of Church Green, Scots, Abbeys, Furzton South, Fenny Stratford and Granby Court. The proposed Bletchley West ward would include the areas of Emerson South, Castles, Fairways, Rivers, Racecourses, Saints and Counties to achieve good electoral equality.
- 59 We noted that all three schemes had used different electorate projections for the polling districts of Eaton North, Poets and Newton Leys from the figures provided by Milton Keynes Council. Using the Council's figures, the impact would leave the proposed ward of Bletchley East (Bletchley South under Milton Keynes Labour Party scheme) with a variance of 12%.
- 60 As noted in the previous section, we were not persuaded to adopt the proposals put forward by Iain Stewart MP. In particular, we were not persuaded that combining Ashland village to the north with Bletchley Park would reflect community identities. This proposal would require changes to the warding pattern in the centre of Milton Keynes where we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final. Furthermore, his warding scheme for adjoining areas would require the use of the A421 dual carriageway as a ward boundary for Bletchley West ward rather than the brook that runs parallel to it approximately a quarter of a mile to the north-west.
- 61 We consider that the brook provides a clear ward boundary in this area and note that residents between the brook and the dual carriageway are able to gain access to the greater part of the Bletchley area across the road via several crossing points and subways. Furthermore, to use the A421 as a boundary would have a significant impact on wards in a number of adjoining areas and would also require a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards for Milton Keynes.
- 62 We have carefully considered the evidence for retaining Central Bletchley within a single borough ward and have explored the alternative proposals put forward during consultation. We acknowledge the strong weight of support in relation to

uniting the Central Bletchley area in a single borough ward. However, our draft recommendations for this area would provide for better electoral equality overall than the alternatives proposed. We do not consider we have received sufficiently comprehensive evidence to justify a significant change to our draft recommendations in this area.

- 63 We remain satisfied that that our recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final. Our proposed three-member wards of Bletchley East, Bletchley Park and Bletchley West are projected to have 5% more, 8% more and 8% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2018, respectively. Our proposals can be seen on the map accompanying this report.

East Milton Keynes

- 64 As part of the draft recommendations, we proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards in the east of Milton Keynes. These include the three-member wards of Broughton, Monkston and Danesborough & Walton.
- 65 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received five submissions relating to east Milton Keynes. Four submissions were from residents in the village of Wavendon who opposed including Wavendon in a ward with urban estates in the centre of Milton Keynes. A submission from Woburn Sands Town Council partially supported the Commission's recommendations for a Danesborough & Walton ward. However, it expressed a preference to retain a single-member Danesborough ward.
- 66 The only substantive scheme received for east Milton Keynes was from Iain Stewart MP who put forward a scheme which departed from a uniform pattern of three-member wards for Milton Keynes. Mr Stewart proposed a single-member Woburn Sands & The Brickhills ward. He further proposed a three-member Wavendon & Walton ward.
- 67 Having considered Mr Stewart's proposed wards for the centre and east of Milton Keynes, we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence was received to support a departure from the draft recommendations. As previously mentioned in paragraph 44, Mr Stewart's proposed Wavendon & Walton ward would combine Wavendon village with the urban areas in the centre of Milton Keynes and Simpson village. To accommodate this proposal would have consequential effects on adjoining wards in the centre of Milton Keynes. Furthermore, although we note that Mr Stewart's proposed Woburn Sands & The Brickhills ward would have clear and identifiable boundaries, we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to depart from a presumption of three-member wards for east Milton Keynes.
- 68 While we note the four submissions for east Milton Keynes that support the retention of a single-member Danesborough ward we have found no evidence to support departing from a uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area. In any event, a single-member Danesborough ward would have a significant electoral variance of 36% more electors per councillor than the average by 2018, triggering the need for a further electoral review of the borough.

- 69 Having considered the submissions received for this area, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final for east Milton Keynes. Under our final recommendations, the proposed wards of Broughton, Danesborough & Walton and Monkston would have 5% more, 3% fewer and 4% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

North Milton Keynes

- 70 As part of the draft recommendations, we proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards for North Milton Keynes. These included the wards of Newport Pagnell South, Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope and Olney. These wards were largely based on the proposals put forward by Milton Keynes Council.
- 71 During the consultation on draft recommendations, we received 13 submissions relating to the north of the borough. These included submissions from seven parish councils, one town council, four local residents and Iain Stewart MP.
- 72 Mr Stewart's proposals for north Milton Keynes were identical to the draft recommendations subject to a minor amendment to Newport Pagnell South ward. This would involve the transfer of the Pennyland area from the proposed Campbell Park & Old Woughton ward. The Milton Keynes Labour Party also proposed the same minor amendment to Newport Pagnell South ward.
- 73 Ravenstone Parish Council supported the draft recommendations for Olney ward. Haversham cum Little Linford Parish Council requested that it remain in a single-member ward but was prepared to accept being placed in the proposed Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope ward. One local resident supported the draft recommendations for Newport Pagnell.
- 74 The main objections to the draft recommendations were from parish councils who objected to the three-member pattern of wards. Sherington Parish Council, along with three other respondents, objected to the parish being joined in the proposed three-member Olney ward. The Parish Council objected to the three-member pattern and put forward evidence that, because of its location between Newport Pagnell and Olney, it looks towards both towns for services. The parish further indicated that with the development of Milton Keynes, residents now look towards the centre of Milton Keynes for further services, reducing their dependence on Newport Pagnell and Olney. The Parish Council requested it should remain in a single-member Sherington ward. This was supported by Moulsoe Parish Council and Emberton Parish Council who requested that the existing Sherington ward be retained.
- 75 Olney Town Council was concerned about the geographical size of the proposed Olney ward and commented that the parishes around Sherington did not have community connections with the parishes in the north of the borough. Olney Town Council supported a two-member Olney ward and single-member Sherington ward with the inclusion of Stoke Goldington parish, and amendments to the proposed Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope ward.
- 76 Stoke Goldington Parish Council objected to the parish being placed in a ward with Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope. The Parish Council put forward

evidence that it looks toward Olney rather than Newport Pagnell for local amenities and facilities. Hanslope is separated from the parish by the M1 motorway and provides 'no services to Stoke Goldington and there are few, if any social or recreational links'. The Parish Council requested that it remain in a single-member ward or as part of Olney ward. This was supported by a local resident who provided evidence of the distances between settlements and lack of shared services between Stoke Goldington and Newport Pagnell.

- 77 We received a submission from Great Linford Parish Council which opposed its parish being divided between six proposed borough wards under the draft recommendations. The Parish Council put forward evidence that this would be contrary to the statutory criteria of community identity and effective and convenient local government. The Parish Council put forward alternatives for the areas around Newport Pagnell to reduce the impact the draft recommendations would have on Great Linford Parish Council.
- 78 Two local residents objected to the draft recommendations to split the town of Newport Pagnell between Newport Pagnell South and Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope wards. Although they objected to the proposals, no evidence was put forward on alternative arrangements to the draft recommendations.
- 79 We note the objections of Stoke Goldington and Sherington parish councils to the draft recommendations. However, we consider there is insufficient evidence to support any departure from the uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area. In addition, the inclusion of Stoke Goldington parish within Olney ward would lead to Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope ward having an electoral variance of 14% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018.
- 80 We also note the objections of Great Linford Parish Council to the draft recommendations and acknowledge that the schemes put forward by Iain Stewart MP and Milton Keynes Labour Party would reduce the extent to which the parish is divided between borough wards. However, to accommodate this would require substantial changes to the warding pattern for the entire central Milton Keynes area for which we have not received sufficient evidence.
- 81 Given the unusual nature of Milton Keynes (a large urban town that is wholly parished), it is inevitable that parishes will need to be split between a number of borough wards in order to secure acceptable electoral equality. In light of this, we consider that the draft recommendations for north Milton Keynes provide the best balance between the statutory criteria and have decided to confirm them as final.
- 82 Under our final recommendations, the proposed wards of Newport Pagnell South, Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope and Olney would have 8% fewer, 9% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

West Milton Keynes

- 83 As part of the draft recommendations we proposed a uniform pattern of three-member wards in the west of Milton Keynes. These included the wards of Bradwell, Loughton & Shenley, Shenley Brook End, Stony Stratford, Tattenhoe and Wolverton.
- 84 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 10 submissions relating to the west of the borough from three parish councils and seven local residents. The Commission also received a scheme for west Milton Keynes from Iain Stewart MP which was based on a mixed pattern of two- and three-member wards.
- 85 We received six submissions objecting to the proposed splitting of the Emerson Valley area between Shenley Brook End and Bletchley West wards. Two submissions supported the draft recommendations for this area. Local residents put forward evidence that the A421 dual carriageway separates the Furzton, Emerson Valley and Shenley Brook End areas from Bletchley. Shenley Brook End & Tattenhoe Parish Council stated that 'members believe that residents of Furzton and Emerson Valley have limited or no affinity with Bletchley West'.
- 86 Mr Stewart proposed an alternative warding pattern for this area. This involved a significant departure from the draft recommendations by using the A421 as the boundary between a proposed Emerson Valley & Furzton ward and Bletchley ward. A proposed Loughton & Shenley ward would consist of the whole of Loughton parish with parts of Shenley Church End and Shenley Brook End parishes. Mr Stewart proposed no change to the Commission's draft recommendations for Tattenhoe ward.
- 87 Having considered Mr Stewart's proposals for Bletchley in paragraph 60-1, we were not persuaded by the use of the A421 as the boundary between West Bletchley and his proposed wards in the west of Milton Keynes. As previously mentioned, there is evidence that residents between the brook and A421 have some access to West Bletchley. The use of the A421 would impact on adjoining wards and require a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards. Using the brook would result in a Shenley Brook End ward containing 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018.
- 88 We are also confirming as final the draft recommendations for the proposed ward of Loughton & Shenley using the entire parish of Loughton as the northern part of the ward. This was supported by Loughton Parish Council. We also intend to retain Tattenhoe ward unchanged from the draft recommendations. These wards would have 2% fewer and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018, respectively.
- 89 In the south-west of this area, a respondent objected to the inclusion of the Crownhill area in the proposed Stony Stratford ward. The submission mentioned that Crownhill has no bus connection with Stony Stratford and lacks community links. The respondent suggested that the future Fairfield and Whitehouse estate developments would provide enough councillors for Stony Stratford ward. However, there was no further evidence as to alternative arrangements for Crownhill.

- 90 Councillor Hawthorn from Abbey Hill Parish Council objected to the proposed Bradwell ward. He said that Bradwell residents had no community links with residents in Two Mile Ash due to the A5 dual carriageway separating the residential areas from each other. He further added that residents in Two Mile Ash will share traffic concerns, schools and a medical centre with residents who will move into the future Whitehouse and Fairfield developments in the Western Expansion Area of the borough. Councillor Hawthorn suggested that Two Mile Ash should remain in Stony Stratford ward with Crownhill being transferred to Loughton & Shenley ward.
- 91 Iain Stewart MP presented a similar argument for not crossing the A5 into Bradwell by proposing a three-member Two Mile Ash & Oakhill ward. This would include the areas of Kiln Farm, Two Mile Ash, Fairfields, Whitehouse, Crownhill and parts of Shenley Church End parish. He suggested that Crownhill and Two Mile Ash will have strong links with the new Fairfields and Whitehouse developments. This would leave a two-member Stony Stratford ward formed of the parish of Stony Stratford and Calverton. Mr Stewart provided evidence of strong historical and community links between Stony Stratford and Calverton and that the electorate of both areas would be the right size for a two-member ward.
- 92 We have carefully considered whether the evidence received is sufficient to depart from the draft recommendations and the presumption of a uniform pattern of three-member wards in this area. Although some community evidence was provided by Mr Stewart in support of a two-member ward, we are not persuaded it is sufficient to justify a departure from a uniform pattern of three-member wards. It would also require the adoption of his proposed amendments further south and the use of the A421 as the ward boundary between the Emerson Valley, Furzton and Bletchley areas rather than the brook. As outlined previously, we are of the view that the brook provides a strong and clearly identifiable ward boundary.
- 93 We have therefore decided to confirm our proposed wards of Stony Stratford, Wolverton and Bradwell as final. These wards would have 3% more, 4% more and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the average for Milton Keynes by 2018 respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

Conclusions

94 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

| | Final recommendations | |
|--|-----------------------|-------|
| | 2012 | 2018 |
| Number of councillors | 57 | 57 |
| Number of wards | 19 | 19 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 3,132 | 3,342 |
| Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 10% from the average | 7 | 0 |
| Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 20% from the average | 2 | 0 |

Final recommendation

Milton Keynes Council should comprise 57 councillors serving 19 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

95 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.

96 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, Milton Keynes 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.

97 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Bletchley & Fenny Stratford, Bradwell, Campbell Park, Great Linford, Newport Pagnell, Shenley Brook End, Shenley Church End, Stantonbury and West Bletchley parish.

- 98 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Bletchley & Fenny Stratford parish.

Final recommendation

Bletchley & Fenny Stratford Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Central Bletchley (returning one member), Eaton North (returning three members), Eaton South (returning three members), Fenny Stratford (returning three members), Granby (returning one member), Manor North (returning one member), Manor South (returning three members), Newton Leys (returning one member) and Queensway & Denbigh West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

- 99 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Bradwell parish.

Final recommendation

Bradwell Parish Council should comprise 10 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Bradwell (returning three members), Bradwell Common (returning three members) and Heelands (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

- 100 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Campbell Park parish.

Final recommendation

Campbell Park Parish Council should comprise 19 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Fishermead (returning five members), Oldbrook (returning seven members), Springfield (returning three members), Willen & Newlands (returning two members) and Woolstone (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

- 101 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Great Linford parish.

Final recommendation

Great Linford Parish Council should comprise 20 councillors representing nine wards: Bolbeck Park & Pennyland (returning two members), Conniburrow (returning three members), Downhead Park (returning two members), Downs Barn (returning two members), Giffard Park & Blakelands (returning three members), Great Linford (returning four members), Neath Hill (returning two members), Redhouse Park (returning one member) and Willen Park (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

102 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Newport Pagnell parish.

Final recommendation

Newport Pagnell Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Newport Pagnell North (returning six members) and Newport Pagnell South (returning 10 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

103 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 propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Shenley Brook End Parish.

Final recommendation

Shenley Brook End Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing nine wards: Emerson Valley North (returning two members), Emerson Valley South (returning one member), Furzton North (returning two members), Furzton South (returning two members), Kingsmead (returning one member), Shenley Brook End (returning two members), Shenley Lodge (returning two members), Tattenhoe (returning two members) and Westcroft (returning by one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

104 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for Shenley Church End Parish.

Final recommendation

Shenley Church End Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Crownhill (returning three members), Grange Farm & Hazeley (returning two members), Oxley Park (returning four members), Shenley Church End (returning four members) and Shenley Wood (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

Final recommendation

Stantonbury Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Bancroft (returning one member), Blue Bridge (returning one member), Bradville (returning four members), Oakridge Park (returning one member) and Stantonbury & Linford Wood (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

106 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regards to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose parish electoral arrangements for West Bletchley parish.

Final recommendation

West Bletchley Council should comprise 28 councillors, as at present, representing 10 wards: Abbeys (returning four members), Castles (returning three members), Church Green (returning three members), Counties (returning three members), Fairways (returning three members), Poets (returning two members), Racecourses (returning two members), Rivers (returning three members), Saints (returning two members) and Scots (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

- 107 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Milton Keynes Council. An 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 Milton Keynes in 2014.
- 108 This report has been screened for impact and 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 Milton Keynes

109 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Milton Keynes Council.

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Milton Keynes.

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Milton Keynes Council

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2012) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2018) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----|----------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Bletchley East | 3 | 9,274 | 3,091 | -1% | 10,487 | 3,496 | 5% |
| 2 | Bletchley Park | 3 | 10,740 | 3,580 | 14% | 10,807 | 3,602 | 8% |
| 3 | Bletchley West | 3 | 11,028 | 3,676 | 17% | 10,784 | 3,595 | 8% |
| 4 | Bradwell | 3 | 9,502 | 3,167 | 1% | 9,248 | 3,083 | -8% |
| 5 | Broughton | 3 | 7,145 | 2,381 | -24% | 10,493 | 3,498 | 5% |
| 6 | Campbell Park & Old Woughton | 3 | 9,589 | 3,196 | 2% | 10,332 | 3,444 | 3% |
| 7 | Central Milton Keynes | 3 | 9,952 | 3,317 | 6% | 10,063 | 3,354 | 0% |
| 8 | Danesborough & Walton | 3 | 8,780 | 2,927 | -7% | 9,769 | 3,256 | -3% |
| 9 | Loughton & Shenley | 3 | 9,895 | 3,298 | 5% | 9,858 | 3,286 | -2% |
| 10 | Monkston | 3 | 8,924 | 2,975 | -5% | 9,639 | 3,213 | -4% |
| 11 | Newport Pagnell North & Hanslope | 3 | 8,888 | 2,963 | -5% | 9,141 | 3,047 | -9% |

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Milton Keynes Council

| | Ward name | Number of councillors | Electorate (2012) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % | Electorate (2018) | Number of electors per councillor | Variance from average % |
|----|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 12 | Newport Pagnell South | 3 | 9,660 | 3,220 | 3% | 9,239 | 3,080 | -8% |
| 13 | Olney | 3 | 9,527 | 3,176 | 1% | 9,451 | 3,150 | -6% |
| 14 | Shenley Brook End | 3 | 9,558 | 3,186 | 2% | 9,668 | 3,223 | -4% |
| 15 | Stantonbury | 3 | 10,735 | 3,578 | 14% | 10,793 | 3,598 | 8% |
| 16 | Stony Stratford | 3 | 7,945 | 2,648 | -15% | 10,290 | 3,430 | 3% |
| 17 | Tattenhoe | 3 | 6,979 | 2,326 | -26% | 9,651 | 3,217 | -4% |
| 18 | Wolverton | 3 | 9,839 | 3,280 | 5% | 10,394 | 3,464 | 4% |
| 19 | Woughton & Fishermead | 3 | 10,544 | 3,515 | 12% | 10,361 | 3,454 | 3% |
| | Totals | 57 | 178,504 | - | - | 190,468 | - | - |
| | Averages | - | - | 3,132 | - | - | 3,342 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Milton Keynes Council.

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

Appendix A

Glossary and abbreviations

| | |
|---|--|
| AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) | A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it |
| Boundary Committee | The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews |
| Constituent areas | The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either |
| Council size | The number of councillors elected to serve 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 ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council |
| Electoral Commission | An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections |
| 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 |
| Multi-member ward or division | A ward or ward 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 www.nationalparks.gov.uk |
| 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 ward 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 Committee 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 www.nalc.gov.uk |
| Under-represented | Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or ward than the average |
| Variance (or electoral variance) | How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or ward 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 |