

# 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	8
Electoral arrangements	8
Canterbury City	9
Whitstable	12
Herne Bay	13
Rural south Canterbury	13
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Canterbury City Council	20
B Glossary and abbreviations	22

## 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 Canterbury City 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 June 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
25 June 2013	Consultation on council size begins
24 September 2013	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to the LGBCE
11 December 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
11 March 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
21 May 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 39 members comprising a pattern of five single-member, 11 two-member and four three-member wards. Our draft recommendations for Canterbury City 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 Canterbury we received 40 submissions, including one from the City Council, two from district councillors, two from parish councillors, eight from parish councils, three from political groups, one from a Member of Parliament, three from local organisations and 20 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

As part of this review, Canterbury City Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a date 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 6.4% over this period.

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

### General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. As a result, we have proposed amendments to boundaries in two areas of the district.

Our final recommendations for Canterbury are for a mixed pattern of seven single-member, 10 two-member and four three-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 Canterbury City Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Canterbury City 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 Canterbury on our interactive maps at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

# 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 Canterbury City 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 Canterbury City Council during the initial stages of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Canterbury City Council*, which were published on 11 March 2014. We then undertook a period of consultation which ended on 20 May 2014.

## What is an electoral review?

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

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

## Why are we conducting a review in Canterbury?

5 We are conducting a review in Canterbury following the Council's request for the Commission to conduct an electoral review. The Council's request was with a view to reducing council size.

## 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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 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

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Canterbury City Council.

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

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 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Canterbury City 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.

13 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.

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

---

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

changes to parish electoral arrangements.

## Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Canterbury City Council and met with members, officers, parish councils and local groups. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 45 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including four district-wide schemes. We received 40 submissions during the consultation period on our draft recommendations. All submissions may be inspected both at our offices and those of the council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

16 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 2009 Act. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of 6.4% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account a number of housing developments planned for the town over the next six years.

17 During consultation on our draft recommendations a local resident queried the Council's forecasts for the Blean Forest area, which contains the University of Kent. In preparing its figures, the Council assumed that the current full registration of students living on the university campus would continue. The resident noted that, under the new system of Individual Elector Registration (IER), students will no longer be registered en masse by the institution and will instead need to register themselves. The resident considered that this was likely to lead to a substantial drop in the electorate in Blean Forest.

18 We challenged the Council on their methodology. The Council stated it was working closely with the university to maximise registration among students. While IER is likely to result in fluctuations in electoral registers across the country when first introduced, levels of registration and the accuracy of electoral registers are likely to improve in subsequent years.

19 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

## Council size

20 Canterbury City Council currently has 50 councillors elected from 24 wards, comprising seven single-member, eight two-member and nine three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed a council size of 38, a reduction of 12 members. The submission from the Council had considered its governance and management structure, scrutiny of the council, work on outside bodies, members' representational role and the Council's other statutory functions. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed no immediate change in council size but considered it could be increased to 57 members over the next 18 years. Having

considered the evidence received we decided to consult on a council size of 38.

21 We received 54 submissions during the consultation on council size. These were from six parish councils, five local organisations, four residents' associations, one district councillor, one political party and 37 local residents. The Council did not submit a representation during this consultation period. The submissions proposed council sizes ranging from 12 to 50.

22 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. Although the submissions received provided mixed support for and opposition to a council size of 38, we did not consider that the evidence received in support of any other size was strong enough to contradict the rationale presented by the Council. We took the view that a council size of 38 would reflect the changes that had taken place since the last review in 2001 while ensuring resilience in the future. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 38 as the basis of this electoral review and invited proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

23 We explained to all interested parties from the outset that the council size figure adopted at this stage of the review provided context for local stakeholders to submit their views on the wider electoral arrangements. We also explained that this council size figure could be slightly adjusted in order to provide for warding patterns that create a better balance between the statutory criteria.

24 The Council's proposed warding pattern was based on a council size of 39 members. We investigated whether a council size of 39 provided the best allocation of councillors across the district. We considered that a warding pattern based on 39 members resulted in a better allocation of councillors between the coastal towns, Canterbury city and the rural area, and would provide for a scheme which would better meet our statutory criteria.

25 In proposing a council size of 39 as part of our draft recommendations we were of the view that such a size would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors' representational role. We have therefore confirmed a council size of 39 members for Canterbury City Council as final.

## 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 (113,105 in 2013 and 120,344 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 39 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,900 in 2013 and 3,086 by 2019.

28 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have an



electoral variance of more than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. We are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Canterbury.

## General analysis

29 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations we received 45 submissions on warding arrangements for Canterbury, including four district-wide proposals. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district.

30 Our draft recommendations sought to reflect the evidence of community identity received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government. We proposed a council size of 39, based on a pattern of five single-member, 11 two-member and four three-member wards.

31 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 40 submissions, including one from the City Council, two from district councillors, two from parish councillors, eight from parish councils, three from political groups, one from a Member of Parliament, three from local organisations and 20 from local residents.

32 The Council was supportive of many of our draft recommendations but proposed a modification to the pattern of wards for Whitstable. The Council also proposed changes to the names of three wards.

33 Canterbury Labour Party and Canterbury and Coastal Liberal Democrats both proposed a number of modifications to wards across the district.

34 Two submissions, from the Alliance of Canterbury Residents' Associations and a local resident, proposed suspending the review until after the Council has finished a governance review. The timing of the governance review is a matter for the Council; there is no requirement for an electoral review to be preceded by a completed governance review. It is for the Council to determine its governance arrangements and the process of reviewing them.

35 The other submissions we received during consultation on our draft recommendations largely focussed on specific areas. The majority of submissions received focussed on our draft wards of Barham, Bridge & Littlebourne, Chartham & Stone Street and Blean Forest.

36 Our final recommendations are for seven single-member wards, 10 two-member wards and four three-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Canterbury.

37 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 20–21) and on the large map accompanying this report.

## Electoral arrangements

38 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Canterbury.

The following areas are considered in turn:

- Canterbury City (pages 9–12)
- Whitstable (pages 12–13)
- Herne Bay (page 13)
- Rural south Canterbury (pages 13–15)

## Canterbury City

### **Westgate and Wincheap**

39 Our draft recommendations for this area were for two two-member wards, as at present.

40 We received one submission commenting on our proposed Westgate ward. The Canterbury Society proposed modifying the boundary between Westgate and Blean Forest to run behind the north of Clifton Gardens, the cemetery and Westgate Close. This was proposed as a consequential change to their proposed modification of the boundary between the wards of Blean Forest and Chartham & Stone Street (see paragraph 85).

41 The Canterbury Society also proposed modifying the boundary between the wards of Westgate and Wincheap to include the development between Rheims Way and the railway line in Wincheap rather than in Westgate. We considered that the community in this area has links to both Wincheap and Westgate, but also has difficulty accessing both, due to the railway line to the south and the A290 to the north acting as barriers. We consider that as the road access for the new development is via the A290 this provides less of a barrier in the area. Therefore, we have concluded that the railway line is the stronger barrier in the area and so have decided to keep the new development in our Westgate ward.

42 We received no other submissions commenting specifically on our proposed Westgate ward, though some commented on the boundary between Westgate and Chartham & Stone Street (see paragraph 83). As we have decided not to adopt the proposed modifications we are confirming our draft Westgate ward as final.

43 We received six submissions commenting on our proposed Wincheap ward. Thanington Without Parish Council, a local resident, the Canterbury Society and the Hill Top, Iffin, Merton and New Lanes Action Group proposed including the rural area of Thanington Without parish in Wincheap ward, rather than in Chartham & Stone Street as we proposed in our draft recommendations.

44 We consider that the submissions demonstrated that the parish of Thanington Without looks towards the Wincheap area for services. Including the whole of Thanington Without in Wincheap ward would also improve the level of electoral equality for the ward. Therefore, we have decided to modify our draft recommendations in this part of the district.

45 The Canterbury Society also proposed including the area east of Nunnery Fields and south of the railway line in our Barton ward rather than in Wincheap ward. We consider that their proposed boundary would divide the Martyrs' Field area and not reflect local community identities. We have therefore decided not to modify our draft recommendations in this part of the district.

46 Our final recommendations are for a two-member Wincheap ward, as in our draft recommendations but with the addition of the whole of the parish of Thanington Without. Our two-member Westgate and Wincheap wards will have equal to and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

### **St Stephen's, Northgate and Barton**

47 Our draft recommendations for this area were for the two-member wards of St Stephen's and Northgate and the three-member ward of Barton.

48 The Council commented that it preferred the boundary between St Stephen's and Northgate wards that it proposed at the previous stage of consultation to that proposed in our draft recommendations. However, it did not propose a change at this stage. We received no other submissions regarding our proposed St Stephen's and Northgate wards. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final. The two-member wards will have 4% more and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

49 We received seven submissions regarding our proposed Barton ward. Councillor Vickers, the member for the current Barton ward, provided a submission focussing on the difficulties of effective local government caused by the number of nightclubs in the ward. She stated that the nightclubs create a large amount of casework, particularly regarding anti-social behaviour. As a result she proposed that Station Road East, the location for one of these clubs, be included in a different ward, though she did not specify which. This proposal was supported by a local resident.

50 We investigated including Station Road East in our Westgate ward, but considered that the city wall that separates Station Road East from the city centre represented the strongest and most clearly identifiable boundary in the area. Likewise, we considered including Station Road East in our Wincheap ward but concluded that the railway line to the south represents a strong barrier. We have therefore decided to keep this area in our Barton ward.

51 Canterbury Labour Party and a local resident proposed dividing our Barton ward into a single-member St Martin's ward and a two-member St Lawrence ward, but did not provide any suggested boundaries or details of the communities in this area. Similarly, the Alliance of Canterbury Residents' Associations commented that our Barton ward included two different communities, but did not suggest alternative boundaries.

52 The Canterbury Society proposed modifying the boundary between Barton ward and Chartham & Stone Street to include all of Nackington Road south of Old Dover Road in Chartham & Stone Street. This is the area around the Kent & Canterbury Hospital. We consider that this area is part of the urban area of Canterbury and has fewer road links to the more rural ward of Chartham & Stone Street. We have therefore decided not to modify our draft recommendations in this part of the district.

53 The Canterbury Society also proposed including the area east of Nunnery Fields and south of the railway line in Barton (see paragraph 45). We consider that this area is better connected to the community in Wincheap.

54 A local resident proposed including Lansdown Road in Wincheap ward rather

than in Barton. As the road is only accessible via Barton ward we do not consider that this would represent effective or convenient local government.

55 We did not receive any other submissions regarding Barton. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final. Our three-member Barton ward will have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

### **Blean Forest and Sturry**

56 Our draft recommendations in this area were for a three-member Blean Forest ward and a two-member Sturry ward. We received nine submissions regarding this area.

57 Canterbury and Coastal Liberal Democrats proposed a single-member ward for this area, containing the entirety of the parish of Harbledown and Rough Common along with the Cherry Drive and St Thomas Hill area from our Blean Forest ward. The remainder of Blean Forest would then form a two-member ward. This was also proposed by two local residents. The proposed ward would have a good level of electoral equality, with 1% fewer electors than the district average by 2019. However, the removal of part of Harbledown & Rough Common parish would leave the Chartham & Stone Street ward with 13% fewer electors per councillor than the district average. We did not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.

58 The Canterbury Society proposed including all of Harbledown & Rough Common parish in Blean Forest ward. They also proposed consequential changes to Chartham & Stone Street (see paragraph 85), Wincheap (see paragraph 43) and Westgate (see paragraph 40). As we are not adopting the proposed consequential changes we are unable to include all of the parish in our Blean Forest ward as doing so would result in unacceptable levels of electoral equality.

59 Canterbury Labour Party proposed that our Blean Forest ward be replaced with one single-member and one two-member ward, but did not propose specific boundaries.

60 As discussed in paragraph 17, a local resident queried the Council's electorate forecasts in this area. In forecasting the electorate for 2019, the Council assumed full registration of students at the University of Kent would continue. When Individual Elector Registration (IER) begins, the University will no longer be able to register all students together; it will be for each student to register themselves. However, while IER is likely to have an impact on the levels of electoral registration in all university towns, the electorate forecasts for the Canterbury review are for 2019. Research into the impact of IER suggests that although it is likely to have an impact when first introduced, registration and the accuracy of electoral registers are likely to improve in subsequent years. Although electoral forecasting is an inexact science, we are confident that the figures in this instance are as accurate as possible. We therefore do not consider that the boundaries of Blean Forest ward need to change in order to accommodate any change in electorate.

61 A local resident proposed that a small section of Stodmarsh Road be included in Barton ward rather than in Sturry. The 2009 Act 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. The proposal from the local

resident would result in Fordwich parish being divided between wards and create a parish ward with only 28 electors. When creating parish wards we generally consider a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors to be unviable.

62 We did not receive any other submissions regarding our wards of Blean Forest or Sturry. We are therefore confirming our proposed three-member Blean Forest and two-member Sturry wards as final. The wards will have 3% fewer and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

## Whitstable

63 Our draft recommendations for Whitstable were for a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards.

### **Seasalter, Gorrell and Chestfield**

64 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received no submissions regarding our proposed Seasalter ward. We are therefore confirming this ward as final. The two-member ward would have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

65 We received six submissions regarding our proposed Gorrell ward. Canterbury Labour Party proposed dividing the ward into a two-member Harbour ward, including part of our Tankerton ward, and a single-member Gorrell ward, including part of our Chestfield ward. These wards would have a good level of electoral equality, at 8% more and equal to the district average number of electors per councillor by 2019, respectively. However, the proposal was not supported by evidence detailing why this alternative pattern of wards would better reflect community identity. Additionally, the inclusion of part of our Chestfield ward in the newly proposed single-member Gorrell ward would result in the Chestfield having 23% fewer electors per councillor than the district average. We do not consider this an acceptable level of electoral inequality.

66 Three local residents expressed opposition to our proposed Gorrell ward, but did not provide alternative warding suggestions.

67 The Council proposed changing the name of Gorrell ward to Whitstable or Town Centre. As Whitstable covers a larger area than Gorrell ward we did not consider the alternative to be an appropriate name. We also considered that Town Centre was not a name specific to the area. We have therefore decided not to modify the boundaries and name of our Gorrell ward.

68 We received no further submissions regarding this area. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our proposed Gorrell and Chestfield wards as final. The three- and two-member wards would have 3% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

### **Tankerton and Swalecliffe**

69 Our draft recommendations in this area were for the two-single member wards of Tankerton and Swalecliffe. We received two submissions regarding this area.

70 The Council proposed combining the two single-member wards into a two-member ward. This proposed ward would have a good level of electoral equality, with 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. However, the

proposal was not supported by evidence of community identity. We have therefore decided not to include this modification as part of our final recommendations.

71 Canterbury Labour Party proposed merging our Swalecliffe ward with the remainder of Tankerton ward that they had not included in their proposed Harbour ward. As we have not adopted their proposals for the centre of Whitstable we are consequentially not able to do so in this area.

72 We received no other submissions regarding this area. We are therefore confirming our draft Tankerton and Swalecliffe wards as final. The single-member wards will have 2% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

## Herne Bay

### **West Bay, Heron and Greenhill**

73 Our draft recommendations for Herne Bay were for the single-member wards of West Bay and Greenhill and the three-member Heron ward.

74 Canterbury Labour Party proposed adjusting the boundary between our proposed West Bay and Heron ward to provide two two-member wards. We considered that the boundary proposed was an arbitrary division of the community in this area and did not provide for a good level of electoral equality.

75 We received no other submissions regarding this area. We are therefore confirming our proposed West Bay, Heron and Greenhill wards as final. The wards would have 5% more, 5% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

### **Beltinge, Reculver and Herne & Broomfield**

76 Our draft recommendations for the north-east of the district were for the two-member wards of Beltinge and Herne & Broomfield and the single-member ward of Reculver.

77 Herne & Broomfield Parish Council supported our recommendations, as did North Thanet Conservative Association.

78 We received no other submissions regarding this area. We therefore are confirming our draft recommendations as final. Our Beltinge, Reculver and Herne & Broomfield wards will have 1% more, equal to and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

## Rural south Canterbury

### **Barham, Bridge & Littlebourne**

79 Our draft recommendations for the south-east of Canterbury district were for a two-member Barham, Bridge & Littlebourne ward which included the parishes of Wickhambreaux, Littlebourne, Ickham & Well, Bekesbourne with Patribourne, Bridge, Bishopsbourne, Adisham, Kingston, Barham and Womenswold.

80 We received 13 submissions commenting on our proposed ward. All the submissions received opposed the proposed ward and suggested the two-member

ward be divided into single-member wards. The submissions received considered that a two-member ward covering this area would not provide for convenient and effective local government. District Councillors Sole and Staley, and the parish councils of Bridge, Barham, Littlebourne and Wickhambreaux proposed an alternative pattern of two single-member wards. They proposed a single-member Little Stour & Adisham ward covering the northern half of the draft proposal and single-member Nailbourne ward covering the southern half. The Little Stour & Adisham ward would contain the parishes of Adisham, Wickhambreaux, Littlebourne, Ickham & Well and Bekesbourne with Patricxbourne. The proposed Nailbourne ward would contain the parishes of Bridge, Bishopsbourne, Kingston, Barham and Womenswold. The proposed wards of Little Stour & Adisham and Nailbourne would have 6% more and 5% more electors than the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

81 We considered that the proposed wards have clearly identifiable boundaries and good internal road links to provide for effective and convenient local government as well as providing a good level of electoral equality. We consider that persuasive evidence has been received to modify our draft recommendations in this part of the district and have decided to include the proposed single-member wards above in our final recommendations.

82 Our single-member Little Stour & Adisham and Nailbourne wards would have 6% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

### **Chartham and Stone Street**

83 Our draft recommendations for the south-west of Canterbury were for a two-member Chartham & Stone Street ward, consisting of the parishes of Chartham, Lower and Upper Hardres, Petham, Waltham and parts of the parishes of Harbledown & Rough Common and Thanington Without.

84 We received eight submissions regarding our proposed Chartham & Stone Street ward. Three respondents expressed concern that the parish of Harbledown & Rough Common was divided between Chartham & Stone Street and Blean Forest wards and proposed a new ward for the Harbledown & Rough Common area. As detailed in paragraph 57, we are not adopting this modification as it would result in a poor level of electoral equality for our Chartham & Stone Street ward.

85 The Canterbury Society proposed removing the part of Harbledown & Rough Common parish we included in Chartham & Stone Street ward and instead including it in Blean Forest. This would leave Chartham & Stone Street with too few electors. To improve the level of electoral equality they also proposed adding the area of our Barton ward south of the junction of Nackington Road and Old Dover Road to Chartham & Stone Street (detailed in paragraph 52). Although this ward would have a reasonable level of electoral equality, with 10% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, we did not consider the proposed boundary to be a good reflection of communities in the area. We considered that the housing around Kent & Canterbury Hospital is part of Canterbury town and would not be best represented in a ward with the rural villages to the south.

86 As part of our draft recommendations the parish of Thanington Without was also divided between wards. The urban part of the parish was included in our Wincheap

ward, while the more rural area was part of our Chartham & Stone Street ward. Evidence was provided that the whole parish looks more towards Wincheap and should not be divided between wards. As detailed in paragraph 43, we have decided to include all of Thanington Without parish in our Wincheap ward as part of our final recommendations.

87 The Council proposed changing the name of Chartham & Stone Street to North Downs. As the North Downs cover a large area of Kent we did not consider that this would adequately reflect the area covered by the ward. We are therefore maintaining the name Chartham & Stone Street.

88 We received no other submissions regarding Chartham & Stone Street. With the exception of the parish of Thanington Without, now wholly in Wincheap, we are confirming our draft Chartham & Stone Street ward as final. The ward will have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

## Conclusions

89 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	39	39
Number of electoral wards	21	21
Average number of electors per councillor	2,900	3,086
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	1	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**  
 Canterbury City Council should comprise 39 councillors serving 21 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

90 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to 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.

91 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, Canterbury City 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.

92 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Harbledown & Rough Common.

**Final recommendation**

Harbledown & Rough Common Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Harbledown (returning four members) and Rough Common (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

93 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Canterbury 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 Canterbury City Council in 2015.



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Canterbury

94 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Canterbury City Council:

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

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

## Appendix A

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

	<b>Ward</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	Barton	3	8,238	2,746	-5%	9,109	3,036	-2%
2	Beltinge	2	5,795	2,898	0%	6,208	3,104	1%
3	Blean Forest	3	8,011	2,670	-8%	9,015	3,005	-3%
4	Chartham & Stone Street	2	5,518	2,759	-5%	5,764	2,882	-7%
5	Chestfield	2	5,580	2,790	-4%	5,890	2,945	-5%
6	Gorrell	3	8,383	2,794	-4%	8,998	2,926	-3%
7	Greenhill	1	3,079	3,079	6%	3,192	3,192	3%
8	Herne & Broomfield	2	6,265	3,133	8%	6,509	3,255	5%
9	Heron	3	9,325	3,108	7%	9,750	3,250	5%
10	Little Stour & Adisham	1	3,164	3,164	9%	3,262	3,262	6%
11	Nailbourne	1	3,117	3,117	7%	3,243	3,243	5%
12	Northgate	2	4,987	2,494	-14%	5,653	2,826	-8%

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

Ward	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Reculver	1	2,969	2,969	2%	3,101	3,101	0%
14 Seasalter	2	6,062	3,031	5%	6,286	3,143	2%
15 St Stephen's	2	6,205	3,103	7%	6,444	3,222	4%
16 Sturry	2	5,666	2,833	-2%	5,921	2,960	-4%
17 Swalecliffe	1	3,175	3,175	9%	3,305	3,305	7%
18 Tankerton	1	2,839	2,839	-2%	3,022	3,022	-2%
19 West Bay	1	3,129	3,129	8%	3,242	3,242	5%
20 Westgate	2	5,709	2,855	-2%	6,164	3,082	0%
21 Wincheap	2	5,890	2,945	2%	6,268	3,134	2%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>113,105</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>120,344</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,900</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,086</b>	<b>-</b>

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each ward varies from the average for the 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 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