

# 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	8
North Cotswold	8
Central Cotswold	9
South-east Cotswold	10
Cirencester	11
South-west Cotswold	12
Conclusions	13
Parish electoral arrangements	14
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Cotswold District Council	20
B Glossary and abbreviations	23

## Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) 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 are conducting an electoral review of Cotswold District Council ('the 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 May 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

---

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
4 June 2013	Consultation on council size begins
3 September 2013	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to the LGBCE
12 November 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
12 February 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
29 April 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

---

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 34 members comprising a pattern of 32 single-member wards and one two-member ward. Our draft recommendations for Cotswold District Council sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

In response to consultation on our draft recommendations for Cotswold we received 111 submissions, including one from the Conservative Group on the Council, one from a Gloucestershire county councillor, three from district councillors, 12 from parish councils, one from a residents' association and 93 from local residents.

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

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

Cotswold District Council ('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 projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% over this period. This growth was largely due to developments across the district.

We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft 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 have sought to reflect community identities and provide strong boundaries. As a result, we have proposed amendments to boundaries in the Lechlade, Compton Abdale and Driffield areas of the district.

Based on strong community evidence which opposed our proposed Lechlade and Fairford South & Kempsford wards, we are amending our draft recommendations in this area. We are adopting a two-member Lechlade, Kempsford & Fairford South ward, meaning that all of Lechlade town is in the same ward.

Our final recommendations for Cotswold are for 30 single-member wards and two two-member wards. We consider our recommendations provide for good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

### What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Cotswold District 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 Cotswold District Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views. 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 Cotswold 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 Cotswold District 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 Cotswold District Council during the initial stages of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Cotswold District Council*, which were published on 12 February 2014. We then undertook a period of consultation which ended on 28 April 2014.

3 We were due to publish our final recommendations in July 2014; however, we have delayed the publication in order to allow for a Related Alteration to be made following a Community Governance Review by the Council. This Related Alteration amends the county electoral divisions in the Cirencester area so that the divisions are coterminous with the parish council boundaries. Without this Related Alteration it would have been necessary to implement some parish wards which would have had no electors.

## What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Cotswold?

6 We are conducting this review following a request from Cotswold District Council. The Council requested that we undertake a single-member ward review. The Commission agreed to the request. The legislation makes clear that, when conducting such a review, we must continue to have regard to the statutory criteria that governs all electoral reviews, outlined in Chapter Two. This, in effect, means that we are not required to recommend a uniform pattern of single-member wards if to do

---

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

so would conflict with the statutory criteria.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

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

8 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the 2009 Act.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Alison Lowton  
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

9 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Cotswold District Council.

10 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Cotswold 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 2009 Act,<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

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

12 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Cotswold District Council or the external boundaries or names of parish and 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.

14 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the 2009 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

15 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority ward arrangements.

---

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

However, principal councils have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct Community Governance Reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

## Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Cotswold District Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 111 submissions during the consultation on the draft recommendations. Apart from the submission from the Conservative Group on the Council, all of the submissions we received focused on specific areas of the district. We received submissions from 11 parish and town councils, one parish meeting, one county councillor, three district councillors, a residents association and 93 local residents.

17 All of the submissions may be inspected 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

18 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 level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 8% to 2019.

19 We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

20 Cotswold District Council currently has 44 councillors elected from 28 wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal for a council size of between 32 and 36.

21 During the consultation on council size we received 10 submissions. In general, respondents supported a reduction from the current council size of 44, with several submissions supporting a reduction to a council size of 35.

22 We considered that the Council's initial submission had sufficient regard to the governance and management structure which would exist under reduced council size, and to the scrutiny of the council, work on outside bodies, members' representational role and the Council's other statutory functions. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 35 elected members as the basis of this electoral review. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 3 September 2013 and ended on 11 November 2013.

23 In response to the consultation on warding patterns, both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups proposed warding patterns based on a council size of 34. They both argued that this council size would result in warding patterns that achieved better levels of electoral equality across the district.

24 We considered the responses received and investigated whether a council size of 34 would provide for a pattern of wards which provided for the best balance between the statutory criteria. Our investigations indicated that a council size of 34 would provide for a better allocation of councillors between the main towns and the rural area and would provide for a scheme which would better meet our statutory criteria. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Cotswold District Council were based on a council size of 34.

25 During consultation on the draft recommendations, we received no further submissions concerning on council size. Therefore, our final recommendations are based on a council size of 34.

## Electoral fairness

26 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 will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

27 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (68,723 in 2013 and 74,211 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 34 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,021 in 2013 and 2,183 by 2019.

28 Under our final recommendations, all of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Cotswold.

## General analysis

29 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 111 submissions. The vast majority of submissions focused on the Lechlade area, while the rest focused on a range of other areas in the district.

30 In addition to the responses which referred to our proposed Lechlade and Fairford South & Kempsford wards, we also received responses relating to Cirencester, Tetbury, South Cerney, and a number of other areas across the district.

31 Every response from the Lechlade area opposed our proposed wards here, with many providing strong evidence of links between the communities of Lechlade.

Many respondents argued that the area on the edge of Lechlade town which we had included in Fairford South & Kempsford ward was in reality a part of Lechlade.

32 Compton Abdale Parish Meeting and Driffield & Harnhill Parish Council both expressed the view that they would like to be in a different ward from those we had placed them in as part of our draft recommendations. Compton Abdale Parish Meeting expressed a preference for being in Chedworth & Churn Valley ward. Driffield & Harnhill Parish Council stated it would prefer to be in The Ampneys & Hampton ward.

33 As part of our final recommendations, we have decided to combine the proposed Fairford South & Kempsford and Lechlade wards into a two-member ward. We are also including Compton Abdale parish in Chedworth & Churn Valley ward, and Driffield & Harnhill parish in The Ampneys & Hampton ward. We are also amending some ward names in Cirencester.

34 In the Cirencester area we propose confirming our draft recommendations as final, subject to some ward name changes. However, in order to ensure effective and convenient local government for electors in the Cirencester Town Council area, we agreed to a Related Alteration to county electoral division boundaries in the town at the request of Cotswold District Council. This resulted in a slight delay to the publication of our final recommendations.

35 Our final recommendations would result in two two-member wards and 30 single-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Cotswold. None of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the district average.

## Electoral Arrangements

36 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Cotswold. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- North Cotswold (pages 8–9)
- Central Cotswold (pages 9–10)
- South-east Cotswold (pages 10–11)
- Cirencester (pages 11–12)
- South-west Cotswold (pages 12–13)

37 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 20–2 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### North Cotswold

38 Our draft recommendations for North Cotswold included a two-member Campden & Vale ward which was a departure from the Council's request for a uniform pattern of single-member wards. This ward would have 8% more electors per

councillor than the district average by 2019. We also proposed the single-member wards of Blockley, Bourton Vale, Bourton Village, Fosseridge, Moreton East, Moreton West, Stow and The Rissingtons. These wards would have 5% more, 8% more, 2% more, equal to the average, 9% fewer, 8% fewer, 6% more and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

39 During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received four submissions relating to this area, from two local residents and two parish councils.

40 A local resident opposed the proposed Blockley ward, arguing that the existing Blockley and Campden-Vale wards ought to be retained. We do not consider that a case has been made for us to depart from our draft recommendations here. We consider that both of these proposed wards provide the best balance of our statutory criteria in this part of the district. The Conservative Group on the Council supported our proposed two-member Campden & Vale ward. We therefore confirm as final our Campden & Vale and Blockley wards.

41 Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council reiterated its desire for the town to be in a single ward. However, as stated in our draft recommendations report, there are insufficient electors in the town for a two-member ward to be created here. We also received a response from a local resident in support of our proposed Moreton East and Moreton West wards. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

42 We received a submission from Evenlode Parish Council, expressing its support for being included in Fosseridge ward, noting that the proposed ward contained parishes with which it has good community links. We are therefore content to confirm Fosseridge ward as final.

43 In summary, we are confirming as final our draft recommendations for this part of the district. Our final recommendations can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Central Cotswold

44 Our draft recommendations for this area were for the single-member wards of Chedworth & Churn Valley, Coln Valley, Ermin, Northleach and Sandywell. These wards would have 8% fewer, 3% fewer, 1% more, 6% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

45 During the consultation on the draft recommendations we received four responses regarding this area from a parish council, a parish meeting, a district councillor and a local resident.

46 Cowley Parish Council supported our proposed Ermin ward, and we have decided to confirm this proposed ward as final.

47 Compton Abdale Parish Meeting, Councillor Broad (Chedworth) and a local resident all opposed the inclusion of Compton Abdale parish in our proposed Sandywell ward. They argued that the parish has stronger links with communities to

its south, in our proposed Chedworth & Churn Valley ward. Compton Abdale Parish Meeting also argued that the A40, which forms part of the northern boundary of the parish, is a barrier between it and the rest of Sandywell ward.

48 We consider that including Compton Abdale parish would better reflect community identities in this area while still ensuring good electoral equality. We have therefore decided to include Compton Abdale parish in Chedworth & Churn Valley ward as part of our final recommendations. This ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, while Sandywell would have 1% more. We are confirming the remainder of our proposed wards in this area as final. Our final recommendations can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## South-east Cotswold

49 In our draft recommendations for this area we proposed the single-member wards of Fairford North, Fairford South & Kempsford, Lechlade, Siddington & Cerney Rural, South Cerney Village, and The Ampneys & Hampton. These wards would have 5% fewer, 8% fewer, 10% more, 1% more, 2% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

50 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 95 responses relating to this area. The submissions were predominantly from local residents, but also came from district councillors, parish councils and a Gloucestershire County Councillor. Ninety of the submissions related to our proposed Lechlade ward, and all of them opposed the split of Lechlade parish between the proposed Lechlade ward and Fairford South & Kempsford ward.

51 In our draft recommendations, we proposed single-member wards for Lechlade and Fairford South & Kempsford which were different from those put forward by the Conservative Group and Liberal Democrat Group during consultation. Their proposed wards were identical, and would have resulted in the wards having 15% more and 14% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. To minimise electoral variances, we proposed a different boundary between these two wards which ensured that the two wards each had electoral variances of within 10% of the average.

52 All the submissions received for this area opposed our draft recommendations. Strong community evidence was received from local residents who argued that the area on the edge of Lechlade that we had included in Fairford South & Kempsford ward was an integral part of the Lechlade community. Residents tended to favour a single-member ward for Lechlade. As noted above, this ward would have 15% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

53 Having considered alternatives in this area, we consider that having a two-member ward, combining our proposed Lechlade, Fairford South & Kempsford wards, would provide the best balance between our statutory criteria. It would ensure that the whole of the Lechlade community is contained in one district ward and ensure that electoral variances are kept to a minimum. This ward would have 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

54 We received three submissions proposing that Driffield & Harnhill parish be included in The Ampneys & Hampton ward, rather than in Siddington & Cerney Rural ward as proposed in our draft recommendations.

55 Driffield & Harnhill Parish Council argued that there are strong community links between the parish and Ampney Crucis parish. It also argued that there are few links between the parish and other communities in the proposed Siddington and South Cerney ward. These views were supported by a district councillor, Councillor Broad (Chedworth ward) and a Gloucestershire county councillor, Councillor Parsons (South Cerney).

56 We consider that there is strong case to include Driffield & Harnhill parish in The Ampneys & Hampton ward, as it reflects community identities in the area and provides for good electoral equality. We have therefore decided to move away from our draft recommendations to reflect this change. Siddington & Cerney Rural and The Ampneys & Hampton wards would have 5% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

57 We received a submission from South Cerney with Cerney Wick Parish Council opposing our proposed division of the parish between the wards of Siddington & Cerney Rural and South Cerney Village. We had proposed this in order to improve electoral equality. The Parish Council favoured a two-member ward for this area, so that the parish is wholly contained within the same ward. We are not persuaded to recommend a two-member ward here. We consider that the proposed single-member warding pattern in this area provides a good reflection of our statutory criteria with wards that follow clearly defined boundaries that reflect communities.

58 In our draft recommendations, we used a different boundary from the one proposed by the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups which would have split South Cerney parish between the wards of Siddington & Cerney Rural and South Cerney Village. We consider that our proposed boundary, which largely follows the River Churn, is a strong boundary. If we had used the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups' proposed boundary and included Driffield & Harnhill parish in The Ampneys & Hampton ward, Siddington & Cerney Rural would have an electoral variance of 14% by 2019. In this instance we do not consider that sufficient evidence has been received to justify a ward with such a high electoral variance. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

59 Our proposed Siddington & Cerney Rural, South Cerney Village and The Ampneys & Hampton wards are projected to have 5% fewer, 2% more and 7% more electors than the district average by 2019. Our final recommendations can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Cirencester

60 Our draft recommendations for Cirencester were for the single-member wards of Beeches North, Beeches South, Chesterton East, Chesterton West, Park & Whiteway, St Michael's, Stratton and Watermoor. These wards would have 1% fewer, 6% fewer 7% more, 4% more, 5% more, 5% fewer, 4% fewer and 1% more

electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

61 We received three submissions regarding Cirencester; these were from Cirencester Town Council, Beeches Community Group and a local resident. The local resident proposed some amendments to the boundaries of our proposed Chesterton East, Chesterton West and Watermoor wards. The resident argued that the split between the two Chesterton wards would not reflect communities in this area. We are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to modify our draft recommendations for these wards and have therefore decided to confirm them as final.

62 Cirencester Town Council argued in favour of having another town councillor, increasing the total number to 16. We can only make changes to parish electoral arrangements as a direct consequence of our recommendations for the district. Therefore, in this case, we cannot put forward a variation in the number of town councillors for Cirencester. In any event, we consider that such matters should be dealt with locally through a Community Governance Review.

63 Beeches Community Group supported the boundaries of our proposed Beeches North and Beeches South wards, but proposed that the wards be renamed 'The Beeches' and 'New Mills' respectively. These alternative ward names were supported by the Town Council. We consider that the proposed ward names better reflect local communities in this area and have decided to adopt them as part of our final recommendations.

64 The Town Council also proposed to change the names of Chesterton East and Chesterton West wards to 'Chesterton' and 'Four Acres' respectively. It argued that these names more accurately reflected the identity of communities in this area, with Four Acres being a name which is well-known locally. The local resident mentioned above also supported the Four Acres ward name. Finally, the Town Council proposed renaming Park & Whiteway ward as 'Abbey'. Again, it argued that this would more accurately reflect the area contained within this ward. We are content to amend the ward names as the Town Council has proposed, as we are keen to ensure that ward names are representative of local community identities.

65 In summary, our final recommendations for Cirencester are for the single-member wards of Abbey, Chesterton, Four Acres, New Mills, The Beeches, St Michael's, Stratton and Watermoor. These wards would have 5% more, 7% more, 4% more, 6% fewer, 1% fewer, 5% fewer, 4% fewer and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. Our final recommendations can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## South-west Cotswold

66 Our draft recommendations for this part of the district were for the single-member wards of Grumbolds Ash with Avening, Kemble, Tetbury East & Rural, Tetbury Town and Tetbury with Upton. These wards were projected to have 1% fewer, 2% fewer, 3% fewer, 4% fewer and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

67 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received four submissions relating to this area, these were from Somerford Keynes Parish Council, Tetbury Town Council and two local residents.

68 Somerford Keynes Parish Council stated that it wished to be in a two-member ward with other parishes that have links to the Cotswold Water Park. A local resident supported this view. We are not persuaded that there is a case for having a two-member ward in this part of the district when it is possible to create a viable single-member warding pattern which reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality. Placing the parish in neighbouring Siddington & Cerney Rural ward, would give that ward a 19% electoral variance by 2019, and leave Kemble with 20% fewer electors per councillor than the average. We are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to justify such high electoral variances and have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

69 Tetbury Town Council opposed the draft recommendations, and favoured a 'holistic approach', rather than splitting the town in to three district wards. However, we do not consider that there is sufficient evidence to depart from having single-member wards in Tetbury. Our proposed Tetbury Town ward is entirely urban, and we consider that the other two wards we have proposed for Tetbury have clear and recognisable boundaries, which have a fair balance of urban and rural populations.

70 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Tetbury and the remainder of the south-west Cotswold area as final. Our final recommendations can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Conclusions

71 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	34	34
Number of electoral wards	32	32
Average number of electors per councillor	2,021	2,183
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

**Final recommendation**

Cotswold District Council should comprise 34 councillors serving 32 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

72 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.

73 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, Cotswold District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

74 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Bourton-on-the-Water parish.

**Final recommendation**

Bourton-on-the-Water Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, the same as at present, representing two wards: Bourton Village (returning eight members) and Bourton South-East (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

75 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Cirencester parish.

**Final recommendation**

Cirencester Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, the same as at present, representing eight wards: Abbey (returning two members), Chesterton (returning two members), Four Acres (returning two members), New Mills (returning one member), St Michael's (returning two members), Stratton (returning two members), The Beeches (returning two members) and Watermoor (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

76 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Fairford parish.

**Final recommendation**

Fairford Town Council should comprise 13 councillors, the same as at present, representing two wards: Fairford North (returning nine members) and Fairford South (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

77 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for Moreton-in-Marsh parish.

**Final recommendation**

Moreton-in-Marsh Town Council should comprise 11 councillors, two more than at present, representing two wards: Moreton East (returning six members) and Moreton West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for South Cerney parish.

**Final recommendation**

South Cerney Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, the same as at present, representing two wards: South Cerney Village (returning eight members) and South Cerney Rural (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

78 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 Tetbury parish.

**Final recommendation**

Tetbury Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, the same as at present, representing three wards: Tetbury East (returning four members), Tetbury Town (returning six members) and Tetbury West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.



### 3 What happens next?

79 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Cotswold District Council. 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 Cotswold District Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

80 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 Cotswold

81 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Cotswold District Council:

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

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

## Appendix A

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

	<b>Ward Name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from Average %</b>
1	Abbey	1	2,082	2,082	3%	2,290	2,290	5%
2	Blockley	1	2,254	2,254	12%	2,294	2,294	5%
3	Bourton Vale	1	2,213	2,213	9%	2,364	2,364	8%
4	Bourton Village	1	2,241	2,241	11%	2,235	2,235	2%
5	Campden & Vale	2	4,561	2,281	13%	4,697	2,349	8%
6	Chedworth & Churn Valley	1	2,105	2,105	4%	2,111	2,111	-3%
7	Chesterton	1	2,115	2,115	5%	2,326	2,326	7%
8	Coln Valley	1	2,109	2,109	4%	2,119	2,119	-3%
9	Ermin	1	2,160	2,160	7%	2,190	2,190	1%
10	Fairford North	1	1,834	1,834	-9%	2,077	2,077	-5%
11	Fosseridge	1	2,179	2,179	8%	2,189	2,189	0%

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

	<b>Ward Name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2013)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from Average %</b>
12	Four Acres	1	2,061	2,061	2%	2,267	2,267	4%
13	Grumbolds Ash with Avening	1	2,139	2,139	6%	2,167	2,167	-1%
14	Kemble	1	2,026	2,026	0%	2,130	2,130	-2%
15	Lechlade, Kempsford & Fairford South	2	4,144	2,072	3%	4,399	2,200	1%
16	Moreton East	1	1,778	1,778	-12%	1,996	1,996	-9%
17	Moreton West	1	1,793	1,793	-11%	2,001	2,001	-8%
18	New Mills	1	1,870	1,870	-8%	2,048	2,048	-6%
19	Northleach	1	2,233	2,233	10%	2,312	2,312	6%
20	Sandywell	1	2,133	2,133	6%	2,201	2,201	1%
21	Siddington & Cerney Rural	1	1,909	1,909	-6%	2,065	2,065	-5%
22	South Cerney Village	1	1,976	1,976	-2%	2,219	2,219	2%
23	St Michael's	1	1,882	1,882	-7%	2,070	2,070	-5%
24	Stow	1	2,217	2,217	10%	2,311	2,311	6%

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

Ward Name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from Average %
25 Stratton	1	1,913	1,913	-5%	2,104	2,104	-4%
26 Tetbury East & Rural	1	1,626	1,626	-20%	2,112	2,112	-3%
27 Tetbury Town	1	1,609	1,609	-20%	2,094	2,094	-4%
28 Tetbury with Upton	1	1,898	1,898	-6%	1,979	1,979	-9%
29 The Ampneys & Hampton	1	2,286	2,286	13%	2,341	2,341	7%
30 The Beeches	1	1,966	1,966	-3%	2,171	2,171	-1%
31 The Rissingtons	1	1,400	1,400	-31%	2,121	2,121	-3%
32 Watermoor	1	2,010	2,010	-1%	2,211	2,211	1%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>68,723</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>74,211</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,021</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,183</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cotswold District 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 District. 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, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary 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