

From: Glenn Watson <glenn.watson@buckinghamshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 December 2022 15:30
To: reviews; Buck, Richard; Ashby, Jonathan
Cc: Nick Graham; Thomas Broom (Cllr); Mathew Bloxham
Subject: Buckinghamshire Electoral Review: Consultation Response from Buckinghamshire Council
Attachments: Final Submission - Buckinghamshire Electoral Review (November 2022).pdf; 1 Buckingham, Winslow & Horwood.pdf; 2 Chiltern Ridges (Chesham N and S, Chalfont St G & LC).pdf; 3 Flackwell Heath & The Wooburns, Chiltern Villages.pdf; 4 Gerrards Cross & Denham.pdf; 5 Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater, Beaconsfield.pdf; 6 Steeple Claydon & Grendon Underwood.pdf; 7 Terriers & Amersham Hill, Totteridge & Bowerdean, Hazlemere.pdf; 8 Swanbourne & Rural Villages.pdf
Categories: Submissions, [REDACTED]

On behalf of the Director for Legal & Democratic Services

Dear Richard and Jonathan,

I am writing to give you Buckinghamshire Council's response to your consultation on the future pattern of wards for this Council.

Please find attached:

- The Council's submission which includes the rationale for the Council's comments
- A set of maps illustrating them (numbered 1-8)

As you will see, the Council is broadly accepting of the Commission's proposed pattern of wards. Our response takes the Commission's pattern as a starting point and seeks to improve it where relevant based on knowledge of the local communities. Consequently, the Council is suggesting changes in only ten instances. In each case, the Council believes that its suggestions will result in a better balance of the criteria. For the avoidance of doubt, for any ward where the Council makes no comment it accepts the Commission's proposal.

One of the Council's suggestions relates to the Commission's proposed ward for Penn, Tyler's Green and Loudwater. The Council agrees that developing a warding pattern for this area is particularly challenging. We considered it appropriate to respond to your clear call for comments on this ward. The Council has suggested an arrangement which seeks to resolve the difficult balance of community identity and electoral equality. The Council's suggestion is one way of achieving this but we recognise that there are other ways of doing so.

The Council would be grateful if the Commission would take its comments into account when finalising the Commission's final proposals. If you have any queries or need any clarification, do let me know.

With regards

Nick Graham
Director for Legal & Democratic Services
Buckinghamshire Council

Tel: [REDACTED]

The Gatehouse | Gatehouse Road | Aylesbury | HP19 8FF



DISCLAIMER FOR BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL

Any views expressed in this email are those of the individual sender and are not necessarily those of Buckinghamshire Council unless explicitly stated.

This email and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. Any confidential, sensitive or protectively marked material must be handled accordingly.

If you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on any of the information contained in the email or attachments, and all copies must be deleted immediately. If you do receive this email in error please notify the sender immediately and note that confidentiality or privilege is not waived or lost.

Buckinghamshire Council may monitor the contents of emails sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with relevant legislation and the Council's policies and procedures. All such monitoring will take place in accordance with relevant legislation including privacy and data protection legislation. For details of how Buckinghamshire Council uses personal information please see the Council's website.

Buckinghamshire Council has scanned this email and attachments for viruses but does not accept any responsibilities for viruses once this email has been transmitted. You should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Buckinghamshire Council

Response to Pattern of Wards Consultation

This is Buckinghamshire Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's consultation on its proposed pattern of wards for Buckinghamshire Council.

Our response contains:

- A. The Council's approach
- B. Wards on which the Council is commenting
- C. Summary of the Council's response
- D. Detail of the Council's proposed amendments
- E. Annexes – plans illustrating the Council's proposed amendments

A. The Council's approach

The Council welcomes the opportunity to comment. In doing so, it has been mindful of the statutory criteria (electoral equality, community identity and effective local government). The Council has also been mindful of indications in the Commission's report as to other factors which have shaped their pattern of wards, including keeping parishes whole where possible, and noting the aspiration to avoid overly large and diverse rural wards.

The Council is broadly accepting of the Commission's proposed pattern of wards. The comments offered in our response take the Commission's pattern as a starting point and seek to improve them based on local knowledge of the communities.

The Council is suggesting changes in only **ten** instances. In each case, the Council believes its comments will result in a better balance of the criteria and are based on a local sense of community identity. In several instances, the Commission mentioned in its report that it was specifically inviting comments or additional evidence. We addressed each of these instances and have made comments on several.

The Council's comments therefore relate to the following wards proposed by the Commission. In each case, we give rationale for the Council's view. In most cases we also supply a plan showing the Council's counter-suggestion superimposed with the Commission's original.

For the avoidance of doubt, for any ward where the Council makes no comment, it endorses the Commission's proposal.

B. Wards on which the Council is commenting

- 1. Buckingham
- 2. Chiltern Ridges
- 3. Flackwell Heath and the Wooburns
- 4. Gerrards Cross & Denham

5. Newton Longville/Quainton
6. Penn, Tylers Green and Loudwater
7. Steeple Claydon
8. Terriers & Amersham Hill
9. Totteridge and Bowerdean
10. Winslow/Horwood

In commenting on these wards, some of the Council's proposed amendments also affect adjacent wards, as indicated in the detailed comments in D. below.

C. Summary of the Council's proposals

Commission's Proposed Ward	Buckinghamshire Council's proposed amendment
Buckingham	Buckingham Ward be amended to include Leckhampstead Parish for community identity reasons, the parish having much more in common with Buckingham than Winslow.
Chiltern Ridges	Chiltern Ridges Ward is far too large and diverse. Parishes better aligned to adjacent wards for community identity and effective local government reasons.
Flackwell Heath and the Wooburns	Little Marlow Parish to be kept whole and to come within Chiltern Villages Ward.
Gerrards Cross & Denham	Denham Parish and Gerrards Cross Parish to be kept whole. New Denham not to come within Iwer Ward. Commission asked to rework their proposals for Gerrards Cross & Denham and for Iwer on this basis to avoid that detriment.
Newton Longville and Quainton	Amend the Commission's proposal by merging the proposed wards of Newton Longville and Quainton to form a single two-member ward of Swanbourne & Rural Villages.
Penn, Tyler's Green & Loudwater	Certain areas of Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater identify more strongly with Beaconsfield. Propose the transfer of these areas to Beaconsfield. Achieving this would also have the benefit of eliminating the Commission's otherwise excess variance for Penn, Tylers Green and Loudwater.
Steeple Claydon	The Commission's proposed wards for Steeple Claydon and Grendon Underwood be merged to form a single two-member. This would better reflect community identity, achieve more effective local governance; and would meet electoral equality.
Terriers & Amersham Hill	Amend the Commission's proposal by creating a three-member ward to be called "Terriers & Totteridge" – by transferring the

Commission's Proposed Ward	Buckinghamshire Council's proposed amendment
	polling districts WG2 and WH2 to a new "Bowerdean" ward and receiving WW and WX (from the same).
Totteridge & Bowerdean	Amend the Commission's proposal by creating a one-member ward to be called "Bowerdean" – transferring polling districts WW and WX to the new "Terriers & Totteridge" and receiving WG2 and WH2 from the same.
Winslow/Horwood	Amend the Commission's proposal for Horwood and Winslow by merging them to form a single two-member ward called Winslow & Horwood in the interests of community identity. This continues to achieve electoral equality. NB Leckhampstead parish would move into Buckingham.

D. Detail of the Council's proposed amendments

1. Buckingham

Proposed amendment:

Buckingham Ward be amended to include Leckhampstead Parish for community identity reasons, the parish having much more in common with Buckingham than Winslow.

Resulting electoral variance:

Buckingham Ward (including Leckhampstead): 11.3% for 3-member ward.

Rationale:

See Plan 1.

The Council is generally supportive of the Commission's proposal for a three-councillor Buckingham with one caveat: we feel that the parish of Leckhampstead should be included within Buckingham Ward. This amendment is consistent with the point you make at paragraphs 48 and 49 of your report and particularly that the communities listed in paragraph 48 look to Buckingham. We strongly believe that the parish of Leckhampstead also identifies with Buckingham in the same way.

We note the rationale expressed in paragraph 54 that Leckhampstead was *not* included on the grounds of electoral equality for Buckingham. However, we feel that the marginal variance of 11.3% is very small margin (and less than the Commission was proposing to accept for some other wards) when weighed against the community links between Leckhampstead and Buckingham. Furthermore, as your proposed ward already links rural and urban areas in Buckingham, the inclusion of Leckhampstead would not violate the integrity of the overall proposal for Buckingham.

2. Chiltern Ridges

Proposed amendment:

Chiltern Ridges Ward is too far too large and diverse. Parishes would be better aligned to adjacent wards for reasons of community identity and effective local government.

Resulting electoral variance:

Parish	Electoral variance of resulting ward
Chartridge Parish	Chesham North (becomes 3 member) 12,573 (-7.3%)
The Lee Parish	
Cholesbury cum St Leonards Parish	
Ashley Green Parish	
Latimer and Ley Hill Parish	Chesham South (2 member) 9,658 (6.8%)
Chenies	Chalfont St Giles & Little Chalfont (3 member) 12,734 (-6.1%)

Rationale:

See Plan 2.

The Council agrees with the Commission's suggestion at paragraph 128 that Chenies parish has stronger community and geographical links with Chalfont St Giles & Little Chalfont Ward. On the same principle, we believe the proposed Chiltern Ridges Ward would be counterproductive to community identities and geography and to effective local government. Consequently, we believe that it would be a mistake to separate parishes from the adjacent, respective wards of Chesham North and Chesham South.

The Council does not agree with the premise that Chesham is distinct from the rural parishes that surround the town. As The Lee Parish Council noted, residents shop in Chesham and use the leisure centre and parks there. The Parish Council commented that parish interests could not best be served by Buckinghamshire councillors also representative of Chesham town. However, effective governance will fall to Buckinghamshire Councillors, and so the perspective of this Council's elected members on this is also of significance. Our alternative proposal is that The Lee Parish together with Chartridge parish (which includes Bellingdon) and Cholesbury-cum-St-Leonards parish (with which The Lee Parish says it has affinity), should come within Chesham North.

As currently proposed, the Chiltern Ridges ward is too extensive and diverse, curving round the top of Chesham, and would be ineffective in local governance terms. Recognising the connections between the parishes and Chesham provides a much more stable basis for representation. We note the comments from The Lee and Cholesbury-cum-St Leonards parishes that their interests would be subordinate to those of Chesham. There is no reason in practice why this should be the case and there is much more commonality between parishes and Chesham than between diverse communities brought together in a geographically elongated and artificial ward.

3. Little Marlow Parish

Proposed amendment:

Little Marlow Parish to be kept whole and to come within Chiltern Villages Ward.

Resulting electoral variance:

Chiltern Villages – 3.8%, 9390, two-member ward

Flackwell Heath and the Wooburns – 3.6%, 14055, three-member ward

Rationale:

See Plan 3.

The Commission's proposal envisages splitting Little Marlow Parish by transferring the Well End portion of it into Flackwell Heath & the Wooburns. The Council thinks that it is neither appropriate nor necessary to do this.

The Council believes it is better to keep the whole of Little Marlow Parish together and to do so within the Commission's proposed ward for Chiltern Villages. This would preserve community identity for the parish and achieve a very sound level of electoral equality across the board.

In paragraph 178 of its report, the Commission invited comment as to whether Little Marlow should come within Marlow instead. We agree with the Commission that Little Marlow would be better served within the more rural Chiltern Villages Ward.

4. Gerrards Cross & Denham

The Council's comment also affects the Commission's proposal for Iver Ward.

Proposed amendment:

Denham and Gerrards Cross Parishes to be kept whole. New Denham not to come within Iver Ward. Commission is asked to rework their proposals for Gerrards Cross & Denham, and for Iver, on this basis so as to avoid the detriment to community identity in both cases.

Rationale:

See Plan 4 – Commission asked to rework proposals based on the principle of keeping parishes whole.

Under the Commission's proposals, New Denham electors will come within the Iver Ward. The rationale leading to this is based not on a concern for the identity of these communities but to solve a consequential problem of electoral variance elsewhere.

There is no relationship between New Denham and Iver. The Commission's report says that New Denham has 'reasonably good links' with the Iver community. In practice, there are no pedestrian or cycling routes between the two areas which are separated by the motorway, a river, a large electricity sub-station, a large quarry and water bodies. The only route is via the A412 over a distance of about 4.5 miles; and would have the odd effect of requiring people to travel out of the ward to reach New Denham, with no connecting public transport. There is no existing community connection; for example, children attend separate schools.

The Council's view is that the Commission should think again and achieve solutions for both Gerrards Cross & Denham Ward and for Iver Ward which start from the principle of keeping both the Denham and Gerrards Cross parish boundaries intact.

5. Newton Longville and Quainton ('Swanbourne and Rural Villages')**Proposed amendment:**

Amend the Commission's proposal by merging the proposed wards of Newton Longville and Quainton to form a single two-member ward of Swanbourne & Rural Villages.

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Swanbourne & Rural Villages - -1.2%, 13,400, for a three-member ward

Rationale:

See Plan 8.

The Commission is proposing two single member wards of Newton Longville and Quainton but has invited comments on them. The Council is proposing that these two areas be merged to form a single two-member ward. In our view this would better reflect the commonalities of the farming and rural network of these areas. The rural identity of these communities is strong. The transport links are effective in all directions, as exhibited by the school transport delivered throughout these communities. A community mini-bus system is also currently being put in place across the proposed two wards, further demonstrating the commonalities between them.

The resulting two-member ward would be capable of effective local representation, would maximise rural identities and would achieve an almost exact electoral balance.

6. Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater (and Beaconsfield)

Proposed amendment:

Certain areas of Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater identify more strongly with Beaconsfield. Propose a transfer of these areas to Beaconsfield. Achieving this would also have the benefit of eliminating the Commission's otherwise excess variance for Penn, Tylers Green and Loudwater.

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Beaconsfield – 10.6%, 9997, for a two-member ward.

Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater – 5.5%, 9537, for a two-member ward

Rationale:

See Plan 5.

The Commission's proposed wards for Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater and Beaconsfield reflects communities' identities in part. The Council proposes that this can be enhanced by the transference of a portion of the former to the latter. These particular areas (indicated on the plan) see themselves as part of Beaconsfield: that is where they go out, shop, where they use community facilities. The schools, churches, public transport and small businesses that they use lie within Beaconsfield. They have no links to Tylers Green or Loudwater.

The Council's amendment is to move the roads to the right of the Penn Road (going towards Penn) and all those roads off Sandelswood End) into the Beaconsfield ward. A separate list of the roads is below. Part of some of these roads are already in Beaconsfield, such as Sandelswood End, which has one of the main junior schools at the end of it. This particular area has a strong identity with Beaconsfield. This is also evidenced by the number of representations sent to the commission requesting Knotty Green to be in Beaconsfield. Out of 200 odd responses, over 50 were from Knotty Green residents all requesting to be moved to Beaconsfield ward.

We acknowledge that this would split Penn Parish. However, the strong community identity arguments and the fact that this would also eradicate the 13% variance which would otherwise occur, are clearly beneficial. It would also help deliver far more effective and convenient local government to these residents because Beaconsfield councillors would more readily appreciate the issues. Furthermore, the Sandelswood End Road and some of the existing roads to the right of the Penn Road are currently split between the two wards and our proposal would solve this by moving the whole section, plus nearby roads, into Beaconsfield.

Roads: Bealings End, Chacombe Place, Berkley Road, Disraeli Park, Howe Drive, Hutchings Road, Knottocks Close, Knottocks Drive, Knottocks End, Lower Drive, Middle Drive, Mynchen Close, Mynchen End, Mynchen Road, Natwoke Close, Netherwood Rd, Oldbury Grove, Robinswood Close, Sandelswood End, Scotswood Close, Shrimpton Close, Shrimpton Road, Upper Drive.

7. Steeple Claydon (and Grendon Underwood)

Proposed amendment:

The Commission's proposed wards for Steeple Claydon and Grendon Underwood be merged to form a single two-member ward. This would better reflect community identity, achieve more effective local governance; and would meet electoral equality.

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Steeple Claydon and Grendon Underwood - -5.1%, 8,584 for a two-member ward.

Rationale:

See Plan 6.

The proposed one-member Steeple Claydon and Grendon Underwood wards would divide small villages which have shared identities and community priorities. Notably in these proposals, the village of Steeple Claydon is separated from Middle Claydon, East and Botolph Claydon which would move into the new Grendon Underwood ward alongside Calvert Green.

Elected members have spoken with these parishes, and all agree that there is a shared identity in this rural community. Residents of the Claydon Parishes and Calvert Green are linked by the ability to shop in Steeple Claydon, their children educated at the local East Claydon School, accessing the library and other community facilities and participating in many local activities. The local major agricultural landowner and rural industry have close links in each parish, plus there are parochial links of the three Churches with a single vicar.

There are significant, unique issues that cover this area, such as the major infrastructure projects of HS2 and East West Rail, and the proposed prison. Parishes and local councillors work closely together as a team and have formed important working groups that come together to strengthen the local voice to represent combined community views.

Our preferred solution would be to merge the proposed Grendon Underwood and Steeple Claydon wards and for that single ward to be represented by two councillors who can represent the significant shared priorities of these connected communities.

The proposal to merge both wards would preserve all parish boundaries and not have a knock-on effect to any adjacent wards. Indeed, merging the wards would deliver better electoral equality (levelling out the -10% variance in Grendon Underwood with the 0% in Steeple Claydon) and achieving a level of electoral equality well within the threshold.

8. Terriers & Amersham Hill (“Terriers & Totteridge”)

Proposed amendment:

Amend the Commission’s proposal by creating a three-member ward to be called “Terriers & Totteridge” – by transferring the polling districts WG2 and WH2 to a new “Bowerdean” ward, and receiving WW and WX (from the same).

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Terriers & Totteridge - -6.8%, 12643 for a three-member ward

Bowerdean - -6%, 4249, for a one-member ward

Hazlemere - -3.3%, 8744, for a two-member ward

Rationale:

See Plan 7.

We believe our proposal improves on the Commission’s own by giving greater focus on the communities concerned while balancing all of the statutory criteria.

The communities in Terriers & Amersham Hill and Totteridge are very closely linked. Prior to 2003, Terriers and Amersham Hill included the northern part of Totteridge ward and was called Green Hill and Totteridge. The historic settlement of Totteridge was the area around Totteridge Lane, encompassing parts of both Terriers & Amersham Hill ward and Totteridge ward. The local bus route, the number 33, serves both wards connecting Amersham Hill and Totteridge Road in the Amersham Hill & Totteridge ward and terminating at Tyzack Road, again in the Terriers and Amersham Hill ward having passed through a considerable part of the Totteridge ward, along Totteridge Road. The residents of Totteridge Road and Totteridge Lane see themselves as part of the same community.

The community facilities that are used by the residents of Terriers & Amersham Hill and Totteridge are shared by the residents of both of these areas. Totteridge Community Centre is close to the boundary between these wards and serves both. The only public houses in the area are situated in the Terriers & Amersham Hill ward but are used by the wider community including those who live in Totteridge.

Creating this new ward will combine the communities of this area which is connected by Totteridge Road, Totteridge Lane and Hatters Lane. The Kingswood Doctors surgery, the Churches of St Andrews, St Francis and St Wulstans RC and the mosques in Totteridge Road all serve the community that resides in the Terriers & Amersham Hill and Totteridge areas. This is also the case for the local schools that have catchment areas that include parts of both these wards.

The Bowerdean area is a disparate community and was a separate ward under the former Wycombe District Council. Polling Districts WG2 and WH2 have more affinity with

Bowerdean than with Terriers and Totteridge. The community links for this area are very much contained within the Bowerdean area with a community centre in Arnison Avenue and a mosque in Totteridge Road.

The number of electors in the two proposed wards meet the statutory criteria for electoral equality. The proposal is for a three-member ward comprising the current Terriers & Amersham Hill ward less the polling districts of WG2 and WH2 plus the Totteridge polling districts of WW and WX from the current Totteridge & Bowerdean ward. We would propose the new ward is called Terriers & Totteridge.

We agree with the Commission's proposal that the area of 'Terriers Farm' is transferred to the Hazlemere ward.

9. Totteridge & Amersham Hill ("Bowerdean")

Proposed amendment:

Amend the Commission's proposal by creating a one-member ward to be called "Bowerdean" – transferring polling districts WW and WX to the new "Terriers & Totteridge" and receiving WG2 and WH2 from the same.

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Terriers & Totteridge - -6.8%, 12643 for a three-member ward

Bowerdean - -6%, 4249, for a one-member ward

Hazlemere - -3.3%, 8744, for a two-member ward

Rationale:

See Plan 7.

As above for Terriers & Totteridge.

10. Winslow (and Horwood)

Proposed amendment:

Amend the Commission's proposal for Horwood and Winslow by merging them to form a single two-member ward called Winslow & Horwood in the interests of community identity. This continues to achieve electoral equality. NB Leckhampstead parish would move into Buckingham.

Resulting Electoral Variance:

Winslow & Horwood – 2.1%, 9234, for a two-member ward.

Rationale:

See Plan 1.

We propose that the two proposed new wards of Winslow and Horwood (1 member each) be combined into a single two-member ward called Winslow and Horwood.

We believe this would meet the statutory criteria and achieve an electoral variance well within the threshold.

Current issues demonstrate the commonality of interests between these communities. These include East West Rail; the new Winslow railway station; the new sustainable travel links for the area including the Winslow Community Bus which serves many neighbouring villages; the new cycle routes to the planned Winslow Station opening in 2024 from Buckingham (completed) and Great Horwood (under discussion); the regeneration plans for Winslow; the housing growth to the north of the town; the Oxford to Cambridge Arc; and road improvements including the upgrade of the A421. Planned new Buckinghamshire Council regeneration schemes in Winslow include a new Sports Hub off the Great Horwood Road, with new community facilities including a library on the former Winslow Centre site, and a new Business Park off the A413 to the north of the town. All these projects will serve the wider local community, not just Winslow town, and it is important that all voices are heard in consultation and engagement.

Councillors representing these voices in one ward would maximise effective and convenient government. It is important that communication and feedback should be consistent across the whole area, and the views of neighbouring villages on these pivotal issues are heard and considered alongside those of Winslow itself.

The Commission's report implies that Winslow has a separate or distinct identity. The Council thinks this is too simplistic. There are hardly any issues specific to Winslow which are not shared by the surrounding area as indicated above. Winslow is not distinct from the villages around it. Rather, it is the local hub for a vibrant set of communities with deep-seated ties and links, and an interest in shared prosperity. The health centre, surgery, schools, shops, post office, vets and many other services are used by residents across the area, not just those in Winslow itself. Many local events which bring together both Winslow and the wider community, such as the Winslow Show, the Christmas Market, and the monthly Farmers' Market which have strong participation from the neighbouring villages. This is all exemplified in the joint communication and joint working across a range of forums, including the Winslow Community Board.

The Council believes its proposed amendment would achieve the best balance of criteria for this area.

NB Horwood as envisaged by the Council would be minus the parish of Leckhampstead, for the reasons given above under our proposal for Buckingham Ward.

30 November 2022.

E. Annexes – plans illustrating the Council’s proposed amendments

Please see the following set of plans which illustrate the Council’s proposals:

Plan 1 – Buckingham; Winslow & Horwood

Plan 2 – Chiltern Ridges (Chesham North, Chesham South, Chalfont St Giles & Little Chalfont)

Plan 3 – Flackwell Heath and the Wooburns and Chiltern Villages

Plan 4 – Gerrards Cross & Denham and Iver


Plan 5 – Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater and Beaconsfield

Plan 6 – Steeple Claydon and Grendon Underwood

Plan 7 – Terriers & Amersham Hill, Totteridge & Bowerdean; and Hazlemere

Plan 8 – Swanbourne & Rural Villages (formerly Newton Longville and Quainton)


END



Map 1 - Buckingham

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = Leckhampstead moving to Buckingham, Horwood merging with Winslow to create 2 member ward



Map 2 - Chiltern Ridges Split

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = creation of two 3 member wards (Chesham North and Chalfont St Giles & Little Chalfont) and one 2 member ward (Chesham South).



Map 3 - Flackwell Heath & The Wooburns

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = Little Marlow CP moving to Chiltern Villages.



Map 4 - Penn, Tylers Green & Loudwater

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = part of Penn CP moving to Beaconsfield



Map 5 - Steeple Claydon & Grendon Underwood

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = merge Steeple Claydon & Grendon Underwood to create 2 member ward.



Map 6 - Terriers & Amersham Hill / Totteridge & Bowerdean

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal


Black outline = Terriers & Amersham Hill to take two polling districts from Totteridge & Bowerdean and become a 3 member ward called 'Terriers & Totteridge'. Bowerdean to become 1 member ward.



Map 7 - Swanbourne & Rural Villages

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal

Black outline = Quainton & Newton Longville to merge to become 3 member ward.



Gerrards Cross & Denham

Colour wash = current LGBC proposal

Black outline = New Denham to remain part of Denham Parish and Gerrards Cross Parish similarly to remain whole.