

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 |
| East Boston | 8 |
| West Boston | 11 |
| Conclusions | 13 |
| Parish electoral arrangements | 13 |
| 3 What happens next? | 15 |
| 4 Mapping | 17 |
| | |
| Appendices | |
| A Glossary and abbreviations | 19 |
| B Table B1: Final recommendations for Boston Borough Council | 23 |

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Boston 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 2011.

This review is being conducted as follows:

| Stage starts | Description |
|---------------------|---|
| 17 January 2012 | Submission of proposals of ward patterns to the LGBCE |
| 10 April 2012 | LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations |
| 19 June 2012 | Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them |
| 31 July 2012 | Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations |

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 30 members comprising three single-member wards, nine two-member wards and three three-member wards. During the information gathering period on warding patterns for Boston, we received 10 submissions, including a borough-wide proposal from Boston Borough Council.

Having considered all the submissions received, we broadly based our draft recommendations on the proposals of the Council. We considered that the Council's borough-wide submission generally provided for good electoral equality and broadly used clear boundaries, but was supported by limited evidence of community identity. Our draft recommendations included a number of modifications to the Council's proposed warding pattern in the town and east of the borough to better reflect access routes and our understanding of local communities.

Submissions received

We received 29 submissions in response to our consultation on draft recommendations. These included submissions from the Leader of the Council, the Labour Group, three borough councillors, seven parish councils, Skirbeck St Nicholas Parish Church, 15 local residents, and a borough-wide submission from Boston Borough Council.

All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period six years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2012. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% from 2012 to 2018. Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content that the Council's projected figures are the best available at the present time. These figures form the basis for the final recommendations.

General analysis

We have considered all submissions received during the consultation on our draft recommendations and, where possible, have sought to reflect the evidence received in these final recommendations. We have proposed modifications to the boundaries in Boston town, and modified the boundary between our Old Leake & Wrangle and Coastal wards. We have also proposed several name changes to wards throughout the borough. Elsewhere, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

Our final recommendations for Boston are that the Council should have 30 members representing three single-member, nine two-member, and three three-member wards. Only one ward will have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. Having taken into account the evidence we have received during consultation, we believe that our final recommendations will ensure good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and providing for effective and convenient local government.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Boston Borough 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 Boston Borough 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.

You can also view our final recommendations for Boston Borough Council on our interactive maps at 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 Boston Borough Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to Boston Borough Council, as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during this information gathering period informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Boston Borough Council*, which were published on 19 June 2012. Consultation on our draft recommendations took place until 30 July 2012.

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 Boston?

5 Based on the January 2012 electorate figures, 39% of the Council's wards had electoral variances greater than 10% from the average. The largest outlier is Kirton ward, which contains 25% more electors per councillor than the borough average.

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

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 on the new electoral arrangements for Boston Borough Council.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Boston is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,² 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 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.

11 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.

12 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 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.

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

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

Submissions received

14 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Boston Borough Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 29 submissions during the consultation period on our draft recommendations. All submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the 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. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers at Boston Borough Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

Electorate figures

16 As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period six years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2012. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% to 2018. Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are content at the Council's projected figures remain the best available at the present time. They form the basis for the final recommendations.

Council size

17 Boston Borough Council currently has 32 councillors elected from 18 borough wards. Following preliminary discussions between the Commission and the Council regarding council size, the Council made a proposal for 30 councillors. In support of its proposal, the Council stated that a reduction in seats on the regulatory committees could allow a small reduction in members. However, the Council argued that the representational pressures associated with Boston's demography, parish councils and residents' groups – as well as the need to secure proportional representation on committees – made a larger reduction unsustainable.

18 We considered that the evidence provided by the Council supported the case that the number of councillors could be sustainably reduced. We were further satisfied that, having explored the possibility of a more significant reduction in council size with officers and Group Leaders, a council size of 30 would allow councillors to effectively fulfil their representational duties. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 30, as proposed by the Council.

19 Following this decision, we commenced a period of information gathering on 17 January 2012. During this period, we received three representations relating to council size. Two local residents asserted that there should be a further reduction in members. A parish councillor argued that, due to population changes in Boston, there should be an increase in councillors. We considered that these representations were not supported by evidence relating to the management structures of the Council or the representative roles of councillors. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 30 members.

20 We did not receive any submissions relating to council size in response to the

consultation on our draft recommendations. We have therefore confirmed a council size of 30 members for Boston Borough Council as final.

Electoral fairness

21 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.

22 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (48,313 in 2012 and 49,829 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 30 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,610 in 2012 and 1,661 by 2018.

23 Under our final recommendations, only one of our proposed 15 wards will have an electoral variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Boston.

General analysis

24 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations, we received 10 submissions, including a borough-wide proposal from the Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for council size or warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

25 The scheme submitted by the Council during the information gathering stage of the review provided a mixed warding pattern of one-, two-, and three-member wards for the rural part of the borough and for Boston town.

26 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the Council's proposed pattern of wards generally provided good electoral equality and broadly used clear boundaries, albeit supported by only limited evidence of community identity. Consequently, we broadly based our draft recommendations on the Council's proposal, subject to a number of modifications in the town and east of the borough to better reflect access routes and our understanding of local communities.

27 Our draft recommendations were for three single-member wards, nine two-member wards, and three three-member wards. We considered that our draft proposals provided for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Boston.

28 Following publication of our draft recommendations, 29 submissions were received, including a borough-wide submission from Boston Borough Council. We also received submissions from the Leader of the Council, the Labour Group, three borough councillors, seven parish councils, Skirbeck St Nicholas Parish Church and 15 local residents.

29 We have considered all submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations. In our final recommendations for Boston, we have sought to address evidence received during consultation and achieve good levels of electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests.

30 Our final recommendations are for three single-member wards, nine two-member wards and three three-member wards. Only one ward would have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2018. A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table B1 (on pages 23–24) and Map 1.

Electoral arrangements

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

- East Boston (pages 8–11)
- West Boston (pages 11–12)

32 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table B1 on pages 23–24 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

East Boston

Rural east: the Coastal parishes, Old Leake, and Wrangle

33 The draft recommendations for the rural east of the borough were for a two-member Coastal ward, which included part of Fishtoft parish, and a two-member Old Leake ward. During the information gathering stage, we received representations from Freiston Parish Council and the Council, both of which stressed the community links between the four parishes of Freiston, Benington, Butterwick, and Leverton.

34 In formulating the draft recommendations, we were of the view that, due to the warding pattern we proposed for Fishtoft parish and Boston town, an arrangement which linked the four parishes of Freiston, Benington, Butterwick, and Leverton in the same ward would have an unacceptably high electoral variance of 17%. Furthermore, such an arrangement would result in a two-member Old Leake & Wrangle ward, in the very north-east of the borough, which would have an electoral variance of -13%. In order to address the issue of poor electoral equality in both wards, we therefore proposed that Leverton be included in a two-member Old Leake ward. This resulted in the wards of Coastal and Old Leake having variances of equal to and 5% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

35 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received eight submissions covering rural east Boston, including evidence provided by the Council. All submissions opposed the draft recommendations for the area, with the exception of the Labour Group, which supported the proposals on the grounds of electoral equality. Furthermore, the Group argued that links between parishes would not break 'simply because they are represented by a different borough councillor'.

36 The parish councils of Freiston, Benington, Butterwick, Leverton, and Old Leake, the Council, and the Leader of the Council all provided evidence which demonstrated a close working relationship between the parishes of Freiston, Butterwick, Benington and Leverton. The submissions detailed that the parishes undertake much joint working, including a mobile library service, and that they pursue joint grant applications for equipment and facilities such as play areas and community halls. The four parishes also jointly nominate a school governor at Butterwick Junior School, share a vicar, and produce a parish magazine between them. Leverton Parish Council included a petition of 251 signatures in their submission, which argued for the parish's inclusion within the Coastal ward and not in an Old Leake ward, as the draft recommendations had proposed.

37 Having considered the representations received, we consider that strong evidence has been provided demonstrating that the parishes of Freiston, Benington, Butterwick, and Leverton form a cohesive community. While there was some support for the draft proposals in the area from the Labour Group, we consider that the evidence of community identity provided by respondents was particularly persuasive. However, we are of the view that a warding arrangement which would include an electoral variance of 17% is unacceptable.

38 We therefore investigated a number of options for a configuration of wards in the borough to accommodate the concerns of Leverton and its neighbouring parishes, while providing for good electoral equality.

39 Firstly, we considered whether all or part of the area of Fishtoft currently included in the proposed Coastal ward could be included in a ward in Boston town. However, while an arrangement which split the village of Fishtoft using Fishtoft Road and Church Green Road provided for good electoral equality in both the town ward of Eastern and in Coastal ward, the split would be an arbitrary one. We consider that this arrangement would divide a clear cohesive community in Fishtoft village. Furthermore, an arrangement which placed all of Fishtoft into the proposed Eastern ward would result in an electoral imbalance of 20%. In order to improve electoral equality to acceptable levels, a substantial and arbitrary remodelling of the wards in the town would be required.

40 Secondly, we considered the Council's proposals for east Boston and Fishtoft, in context of both the evidence of community provided for Leverton and the evidence received for the town and Fishtoft (this assessment is detailed in paragraphs 43–48). We concluded that the Council's proposal provided the best balance between the statutory criteria and that it should be adopted for east Boston and Fishtoft and the rural east.

41 We have therefore decided to depart from the draft recommendations in this area and include Leverton in a two-member Coastal ward as part of our final recommendations. To reflect the new arrangements, we propose that the ward of Old Leake is renamed Old Leake & Wrangle, consistent with the Council's proposal. This modification, along with the changes outlined below (in paragraphs 43–48), would result in the wards of Old Leake & Wrangle and Coastal having 13% fewer and 10% fewer electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively. We consider that a 13% variance in the proposed Old Leake & Wrangle ward is justified – given its geographical location in the north-east corner of the borough and the evidence provided regarding Leverton.

East Boston town and Fishtoft

42 The draft recommendations for the east of Boston town and Fishtoft were for a mixed-member pattern comprising the two-member Haven & Skirbeck ward and the three-member Trinity and Eastern wards. Although the town itself is unparished, to the immediate east of the town a number of individual houses and whole developments have crossed into Fishtoft parish. This means that the western boundary of Fishtoft parish is defaced³ in multiple locations. As a means of addressing this defaced boundary, the draft recommendations proposed that the wards of Haven & Skirbeck, Trinity, and Eastern each included part of Fishtoft parish. The remainder of Fishtoft parish was included in a two-member Coastal ward.

43 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received 18 submissions for this area, including evidence from the Council. Of these representations, 15 disagreed with the draft recommendations for the proposed Haven & Skirbeck and Eastern wards. The Labour Group, 10 residents, two councillors, St Nicholas Church and the Council argued that St Nicholas Church and St Nicholas community centre on Fishtoft Road served the community of Woad Farm and Skirbeck, to the north of Kingsway. In particular, St Nicholas school was cited as having close links with St Nicholas Church and St Nicholas community centre. The rector of the church, as well as the chairman of the community centre and local residents, argued that the community was divided under the draft recommendations and that the north-south orientation of the current ward boundaries should be retained.

44 The Council argued that the Haven and College wards it had proposed during information gathering should be combined to create a three-member Haven & Skirbeck ward, which would provide for good electoral equality and reflect the community evidence received.

45 The Labour Group stated their support for the draft recommendations in regard to the warding of Fishtoft parish, arguing that the developments included in the town wards have no historical connections to Fishtoft village and that they are 'much more affected by town rather than rural issues'. However, Fishtoft Parish Council and the Council disagreed with the warding pattern to divide Fishtoft parish. The Council argued that the urban overspill 'has always clearly remained within the parish of Fishtoft'. Furthermore, the Council and Fishtoft Parish Council argued that splitting the parish into four borough wards, represented by a total of 10 councillors, did not represent effective and convenient local government.

46 Having considered the evidence received, we are of the view that the draft recommendations would divide the community of Skirbeck. Furthermore, we note the opposition to splitting the parish of Fishtoft and the support for using the parish boundary as the basis for a ward boundary, despite the fact that it is defaced. In order to reflect local community identities and in order to accommodate Leverton parish in Coastal ward, we consider that the Council's proposal for east Boston and Fishtoft provides the best balance between the statutory criteria, despite the defaced boundary.

47 Under this proposal, the western boundary of Fishtoft parish would form the eastern ward boundaries of a two-member Trinity ward and a three-member Skirbeck

³ A boundary becomes defaced when the ground detail the boundary was previously following is destroyed.

ward. This would result in a three-member Fishtoft ward, comprising the entirety of Fishtoft parish.

48 However, we have proposed two minor modifications to the Council's scheme in east Boston and Fishtoft. The Council's proposal to use Spayne Road as a southern boundary for Trinity ward does not provide for a ward with complete internal communication links. In order to address this, we propose to adjust the southern boundary of Trinity ward so that it runs along the southern side of Rowley Road. As a result of this change, Trinity ward would have an electoral variance of 12%. We therefore propose a slight modification to the north-west boundary of Skirbeck ward, extending the boundary around Rochford Crescent, the housing of which is of a similar nature to those to its immediate east. This provides for improved electoral equality in Trinity ward.

49 Under our final recommendations, the wards of Trinity, Skirbeck, and Fishtoft would have 8% more, 1% more, and 10% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

West Boston

West Boston town

50 The draft recommendations for the west of Boston town were for a mixed-member pattern comprising the single-member Station, Western, and St Thomas' wards, and the two-member North West, Witham, and Staniland wards. These wards were based on the Council's proposal for the area. The wards used strong boundaries, kept communities together, allowed for communication links, and provided for good levels of electoral equality.

51 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received three submissions regarding this area of the borough. Councillor Austin proposed a reconfiguration of Station ward. She proposed that a housing development in Haven & Skirbeck ward east of the railway line should be included in a Station ward. Councillor Austin did not provide strong evidence of community identity to support this modification. A local resident also proposed a reconfiguration of Station ward, suggesting that the railway line should be used as a boundary and that the roads between Brothertoft Road and Carlton Road should be included in the proposed North West ward. However, this configuration would create an electoral imbalance of 28% for the North West ward. We do not propose to modify our proposed Station ward and confirm it as final.

52 Alternative ward names were also proposed for this area. Councillor Austin suggested that our Western ward should be named simply 'West', stating that this would be 'unambiguous' and that Western carried 'other associations to most people'. Councillor Austin and the Labour Group also proposed alternative names for our North West ward. Councillor Austin proposed 'Fenside & Zion' and the Labour Group proposed 'Fenside' or 'St Christopher's'. There was general agreement that the North West ward generally comprised the Fenside area of Boston.

53 Having considered the evidence received, we propose that Western ward be renamed West and that the North West ward be renamed Fenside. We consider that the name changes more accurately reflect the communities within both of the wards. We received no further proposals for the remainder of west Boston and we therefore

confirm the draft recommendations for these wards as final. Under our final recommendations the wards of Station, Fenside, Staniland, St Thomas', Witham, and West would have 4% fewer, 1% more, 7% fewer, 6% more, equal to, and 1% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

Rural west: Swineshead, the Villages, Kirton, and Wyberton

54 The draft recommendations for this area proposed a mixed pattern of two- and three-member wards for Swineshead & Holland Fen, Five Village, Frampton & Kirton, and Wyberton. These wards were based, without modification, on the Council's proposals for the area. The wards used strong boundaries, kept communities together, provided for communication links between parishes, and had good levels of electoral equality.

55 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received two submissions covering the rural west of the borough. Frampton Parish Council supported the draft recommendations, while Councillor Austin suggested that the three-member Frampton & Kirton ward should be renamed Kirton with Frampton, citing Kirton as the larger village.

56 In considering the representations received, we consider that the name change proposed by Councillor Austin for Frampton & Kirton more accurately reflects the communities within the ward. Consequently, we propose that our Frampton & Kirton ward be renamed Kirton & Frampton, with a minor modification to the grammatical conjunction to reflect both communities. In the remainder of this area, we confirm the draft recommendations as final. Under the final recommendations, the three-member Kirton & Frampton and two-member Swineshead & Holland Fen, Five Village, and Wyberton wards would have 5% more, 5% fewer, 4% fewer, and 6% more electors than the borough average by 2018, respectively.

Conclusions

57 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 | 30 | 30 |
| Number of electoral wards | 15 | 15 |
| Average number of electors per councillor | 1,610 | 1,661 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average | 2 | 1 |
| Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average | 0 | 0 |

Final recommendation
 Boston Borough Council should comprise 30 councillors serving 15 wards, as detailed and named in Table B1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

58 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.

59 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, Boston Borough 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.

60 At draft recommendations stage, consequential parish electoral arrangements were proposed for the parish of Fishtoft.

61 As a consequence of our final recommendations, the parish of Fishtoft is no longer divided by borough ward boundaries. Therefore, consequential parish electoral arrangements are no longer required in any part of the borough.

3 What happens next?

62 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Boston Borough 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 Boston Borough Council in 2015.

Equalities

63 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 Boston

64 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Boston Borough Council:

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

You can also view our final recommendations for Boston Borough on our interactive maps at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

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 |
| 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 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 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 www.nalc.gov.uk |
| 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 district, 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 district council |

Appendix B

Table B1: Final recommendations for Boston Borough 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 | Coastal | 2 | 2,981 | 1,491 | -7% | 2,997 | 1,499 | -10% |
| 2 | Fenside | 2 | 3,321 | 1,661 | 3% | 3,344 | 1,672 | 1% |
| 3 | Fishtoft | 3 | 5,414 | 1,804 | 12% | 5,486 | 1,829 | 10% |
| 4 | Five Village | 2 | 3,111 | 1,556 | -3% | 3,174 | 1,587 | -4% |
| 5 | Kirton & Frampton | 3 | 5,147 | 1,715 | 7% | 5,211 | 1,737 | 5% |
| 6 | Old Leake & Wrangle | 2 | 2,720 | 1,360 | -16% | 2,888 | 1,444 | -13% |
| 7 | Skirbeck | 3 | 4,798 | 1,599 | -1% | 5,029 | 1,676 | 1% |
| 8 | St Thomas' | 1 | 1,649 | 1,649 | 2% | 1,766 | 1,766 | 6% |
| 9 | Staniland | 2 | 3,004 | 1,502 | -7% | 3,077 | 1,539 | -7% |
| 10 | Station | 1 | 1,473 | 1,473 | -9% | 1,587 | 1,587 | -4% |
| 11 | Swineshead & Holland Fen | 2 | 3,069 | 1,535 | -5% | 3,154 | 1,577 | -5% |
| 12 | Trinity | 2 | 3,535 | 1,768 | 10% | 3,585 | 1,793 | 8% |

Table B1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Boston Borough 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 % |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 13 West | 1 | 1,497 | 1,497 | -7% | 1,678 | 1,678 | 1% |
| 14 Witham | 2 | 3,089 | 1,545 | -4% | 3,322 | 1,661 | 0% |
| 15 Wyberton | 2 | 3,505 | 1,752 | 9% | 3,531 | 1,766 | 6% |
| Totals | 30 | 48,313 | - | - | 49,829 | - | - |
| Averages | - | - | 1,610 | - | - | 1,661 | - |

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Boston Borough 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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors.