

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	6
Final recommendations	11
Basingstoke & Deane Borough	12
East Hampshire District	15
Eastleigh Borough	18
Fareham Borough	21
Gosport Borough	23
Hart District	25
Havant Borough	27
New Forest District	30
Rushmoor Borough	37
Test Valley Borough	39
Winchester City	42
Conclusions	45
Parish electoral arrangements	45
3 What happens next?	49

## Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council	50
B Submissions received	57
C Glossary and abbreviations	62



# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Hampshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Hampshire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in County Council elections varies depending on where you live in Hampshire. Overall, 44% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%.

## Our proposals for Hampshire

Hampshire County Council currently has 78 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that retaining the existing council size of 78 members will ensure the Council can perform its roles and responsibilities effectively.

## Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Hampshire County Council's 78 councillors should represent 74 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. None of our proposed 76 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Hampshire by 2021.

**We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements in Hampshire.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review was conducted following our decision to review Hampshire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 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)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations. This review was conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
19 May 2015	Decision on council size
26 May 2015	Division pattern consultation
17 November 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
12 January 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
10 May 2016	Further limited consultation for Havant and New Forest
6 September 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division 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?

6 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:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Dr Peter Knight CBE DL

Sir Tony Redmond

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> 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 divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	<b>2014</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Hampshire	1,020,276	1,079,999
Number of councillors	78	78
Average number of electors per councillor	13,080	13,846

10 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Hampshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Hampshire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

---

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

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in September 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 6% by 2021. Basingstoke & Deane Borough is projected to have high amounts of growth during this period.

15 During the preliminary period we received a query relating to the electorate forecasts in Test Valley Borough, in particularly in Romsey. We invited the County Council to look into this matter and submit a response. The County Council provided evidence as to how it has reapportioned the electorate in Romsey. We are satisfied that this method provides the most accurate reflection of the likely increase in electorate in Romsey and used these forecasts for Romsey and the rest of the county as the basis for our draft recommendations. We received no comments regarding the electorate forecasts during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have therefore used the forecasts provided by Hampshire County Council as the basis for our final recommendations.

## Council size

16 Hampshire County Council currently has 78 councillors. The County Council submitted a proposal to retain the existing council size. The County Council demonstrated that it could operate efficiently and effectively under its proposed council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 78 councillors.

17 During the consultation on the draft recommendations we received a few submissions requesting an increase in council size to 79, with respondents suggesting an increase to the allocation of councillors in New Forest District to 11. Under our draft recommendations we had allocated 10 county councillors to New Forest District. None of the submissions received provided persuasive evidence to move away from a council size of 78. In terms of allocating the number of county councillors to each district we divide the total number of electors for that district by the county councillor to elector ratio. This calculation indicates that New Forest District should only be allocated 10 councillors under a council size of 78. We have therefore decided to base our final recommendations on 78 elected members.

18 A council size of 78 provides the following allocation between the district/borough councils in the county. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of district and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Basingstoke & Deane Borough – 10 councillors (66%)
- East Hampshire District – seven councillors (92%)
- Eastleigh Borough – eight councillors (74%)
- Fareham Borough – seven councillors (87%)
- Gosport Borough – five councillors (82%)
- Hart District – five councillors (45%)
- Havant Borough – seven councillors (64%)
- New Forest District – 10 councillors (88%)
- Rushmoor Borough – five councillors (77%)
- Test Valley Borough – seven councillors (50%)
- Winchester City – seven councillors (50%)

## Division patterns

19 During the consultation on division patterns, we received 102 submissions including a county-wide proposal from Hampshire County Council. We also received district/borough schemes for East Hampshire, Fareham, Hart, Havant, Rushmoor and Test Valley. The remainder of submissions received were from political groups, parish and town councils, councillors, local organisations and local residents from across the county. These respondents provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of Hampshire. These submissions informed us in formulating our draft recommendations.

## Draft recommendations

20 We received 150 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. We received localised and county-wide comments relating to each of the 11 district/borough areas of the county. The majority of submissions concentrated on our proposals for Alton Town and Alton Rural divisions in East Hampshire district; Brockenhurst, Lyndhurst & Fordingbridge and Milford & Hordle divisions in New Forest District; and Andover North, Andover South and Andover West divisions in Test Valley district.

### **Basingstoke & Deane Borough**

21 We received seven submissions relating to Basingstoke & Deane Borough. The County Council supported our draft recommendations for the borough. In Basingstoke, we received an alternative pattern of five divisions. One of the proposed divisions in the Buckskin area did not provide for a clear and identifiable division boundary. Therefore, we were unable to accept the alternative pattern of divisions for Basingstoke. We also received comments from respondents relating to Pamber Heath. It was proposed the area should be included in the Tadley & Baughurst division. However, this change would result in an electoral variance above 10%.

22 We received a submission on the name of our proposed Candovers and Whitchurch & Clere divisions. Based on the evidence received we have decided to re-name the divisions Candovers, Oakley & Overton and Whitchurch & The Cleres as part of our final recommendations. Elsewhere in Basingstoke & Deane borough, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

### **East Hampshire District**

23 We received 25 submissions relating to East Hampshire District. The majority of respondents objected to our proposals for Alton Rural and Alton Town divisions. The County Council proposed a modified pattern for both divisions. We also received persuasive evidence from respondents to include the Holybourne area in Alton Town division. Based on the evidence received, we have moved away from our draft recommendations and now propose modified Alton Rural and Alton Town divisions which are identical to the existing divisions.

24 We also received submissions on the name of our proposed Liphook & Headley division. Based on the evidence received we have decided to re-name the division Liphook, Headley & Grayshott division as part of our final recommendations. Elsewhere in East Hampshire District, we have confirmed as draft recommendations as final.

### **Eastleigh Borough**

25 We received 19 submissions relating to Eastleigh Borough. The majority of respondents objected to our proposed Botley & Fair Oak and Hedge End & West End divisions. The County Council and Borough Council proposed a broadly similar pattern of three single-member divisions covering this area. This pattern of divisions was supported by Botley Parish Council, Botley Parish Action Group, West End Parish Council and local residents. We are persuaded that the evidence submitted for the alternative divisions would better reflect community identities and have decided to move away from our draft recommendations. We have proposed to use the M27 motorway as the division boundary between Hedge End and Bursledon rather than Pylands Lane as the motorway provided for a clear and identifiable division boundary.

26 Where we have received objections to our draft recommendations in other areas of the borough, we did not consider that persuasive evidence was received to move away from our draft recommendations. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for the remaining divisions in Eastleigh Borough as final.

### **Fareham Borough**

27 We received five submissions relating to Fareham Borough. The majority of comments focused on divisions in the east of the borough. The County Council supported our draft recommendations for the borough. One of the respondents objected to our proposed two-member Fareham Town division and proposed an alternative pattern consisting of two single-member divisions and changes to our Fareham Titchfield division. Another respondent objected to our proposed Fareham Crofton division and the division name. It was argued that the division should not include part of the urban area of Fareham. However, not including part of Fareham in Fareham Crofton division would result in an electoral variance above 10%. We also consider our proposed division name better reflects the communities within the division. Two respondents objected to roads west of Downend Road and Shearwater Avenue being included in Fareham Portchester division. However, we are not persuaded by the evidence received to make this change and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations in the Portchester area.

28 Where we have received objections to our draft recommendations in other areas of the borough, we did not consider that persuasive evidence was received to move away from our draft recommendations for Fareham Crofton, Fareham Portchester, Fareham Titchfield and Fareham Town divisions or justify electoral

variances above 10%. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for divisions in Fareham Borough as final.

### **Gosport Borough**

29 We received five submissions relating to Gosport Borough. One of the submissions proposed to divide our two-member Leesland & Town division into two single-member divisions. However, we do not consider the evidence was persuasive to move away from our draft recommendations. We also received support for our proposed Leesland & Town division. Three other respondents proposed changes to the division boundary between Hardway and Leesland & Town divisions. However, the evidence received was not persuasive and we consider our proposed divisions better reflect our statutory criteria. We have therefore confirmed our draft recommendations for divisions in Gosport Borough as final.

### **Hart District**

30 We received 15 submissions relating to Hart district. The majority of respondents objected to our proposals which divided Elvetham Heath parish between two divisions. It was argued that the Pondtail area of Fleet should be divided between divisions instead of Elvetham Heath. The evidence received did not specify exactly where the Pondtail area should be divided. In addition, dividing the Pondtail area would not provide for a clear and identifiable division boundary. We have therefore confirmed our draft recommendations relating to Elvetham Heath as final.

31 In Fleet, the parish council proposed changes to the parish warding arrangements as part of this review. We can only make changes to parish warding arrangements as a direct consequence of our recommendations. The District Council has the power to make changes to parish warding arrangements by way of Community Governance Review. We therefore have made no changes to our parish warding arrangements for Fleet Town parish.

32 We also received submissions on the name of our proposed Fleet North & Yateley East division. Respondents suggested we should rename this division Fleet North, Yateley East & Blackwater. We considered the division name proposed to be too long. Therefore, we have decided to re-name the division Yateley East & Blackwater which better reflects the communities within the division. Elsewhere in Hart district, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

### **Havant Borough**

33 We received six submissions relating to Havant Borough. We received support for the draft recommendations covering Cowplain, Purbrook and Waterlooville. However, some respondents objected to Denvilles divided between North East Havant and Emsworth & St Faiths divisions. A political group proposed three alternative divisions covering Bedhampton, Havant and Emsworth. Given that this pattern had not been consulted upon previously, we decided to consult locally in Havant on whether this pattern of three divisions should be part of our final recommendations.

34 We received 19 submissions during the period of further limited consultation in Havant. We received a mixture of support and objection to our alternative Havant Central, Havant Coastal and Havant North divisions. Some local respondents argued that our alternative proposals divided central Havant between divisions. However, other respondents supported the alternative proposals for central Havant and for

Denvilles, Emsworth and Langstone being in the same division.

35 During the development of the final recommendations, we discovered that we had misallocated a polling district in Havant Central division. The result of this would be a Havant Central division with 18% more electors than the county average. An alternative pattern to rectify the error would result in boundary changes between Havant Central and Havant Coastal divisions for which we have no supporting evidence. Despite this error, we received submissions in support of the draft recommendations. It was argued the draft recommendations for Havant provided for better coterminosity with borough wards and reflected community identities in central Havant. We are content with the evidence in support of our draft recommendations. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final.

### **New Forest District**

36 We received 30 submissions relating to New Forest District. The majority of submissions were against the draft recommendations. In particular, we received objections to our proposed Brockenhurst, Lymington & Boldre, Lyndhurst & Fordingbridge, Milford & Hordle, New Milton, Ringwood and Totton North divisions. The County Council and District Council proposed new divisions for most of New Forest which were different from the draft recommendations. We considered the County Council's proposals better reflected community identities and decided to consult locally in New Forest on whether the alternative pattern of divisions should be part of our final recommendations.

37 We received 62 submissions during the period of further limited consultation. Our further draft proposals were supported by 15 respondents. However, over 30 respondents objected to Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley and Hyde parishes being included in Ringwood division. Respondents also objected to our proposed Lymington & Boldre, New Milton and Milford & Hordle divisions. We consider that the evidence to include Hyde parish in Lyndhurst & Fordingbridge division was supported by persuasive evidence. We have therefore modified our further draft recommendations in this area.

38 We received submissions which proposed new division names for Brockenhurst, Lyndhurst & Fordingbridge, Milford & Hordle, New Milton, Ringwood and Totton North divisions. We have not adopted the alternative division names (Mid-Forest and West Forest) proposed for Brockenhurst and Ringwood respectively as we considered the names to be too generic and would not reflect community identities. However, we were satisfied that the proposed name changes for Milford & Hordle and Totton North divisions provided for a better reflection of community identities. Therefore, we have adopted the division name of New Milton North, Milford & Hordle and Totton North & Netley Marsh as part of our final recommendations.

### **Rushmoor Borough**

39 We received eight submissions relating to Rushmoor Borough. The County Council and Borough Council both submitted proposals for modified Farnborough North and Farnborough West divisions, in particular, they suggested changes in the Newfield Road area. We considered that the comments of the Borough Council were persuasive and have decided to modify the division boundary between Farnborough North and Farnborough West divisions.

40 We received support for our draft recommendations in Aldershot. However, respondents in this area commented on the names of our proposed Aldershot East and Aldershot West divisions. Based on the evidence received we have decided to re-name the divisions Aldershot North and Aldershot South.

### **Test Valley Borough**

41 We received 20 submissions relating to Test Valley Borough. The County Council supported our draft recommendations for the borough. We also received objections to our draft recommendations for Andover and surrounding parishes. Andover Town Council proposed an alternative division pattern for Andover North, Andover South, Andover West and Test Valley Central divisions. However, this alternative resulted in a Test Valley Central division with an electoral variance above 10%. We considered the evidence of Andover Town Council did not justify why we should accept a division with a poor level of electoral equality. We also received a submission relating to Andover Town Council's parish warding arrangements. However, we are not inclined to make further changes to Andover Town Council's warding arrangements as we have not received evidence from the Town Council that it supports such a change and we consider this is a power which the Borough Council can exercise by way of a Community Governance Review.

42 We also received objections to our draft recommendations from respondents in Romsey Extra parish. Local residents in Crampmoor argued for the area to be included in our Romsey Rural division. We find the evidence submitted to be persuasive and have decided to amend the division boundary to include Crampmoor in Romsey Rural division. We also considered the evidence to include Mottisfont parish in Test Valley Central division to be supported by persuasive evidence and have amended the division boundary to reflect the evidence received. Elsewhere in Test Valley Borough, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

### **Winchester City**

43 We received 19 submissions relating to Winchester City District. The County Council and seven respondents supported our draft recommendations in localised parts of the district. The City Council and several respondents commented that Soberton parish should be within one division rather than divided between two divisions. We have decided to modify the draft recommendations to include Soberton parish in Winchester Southern Parishes division. This modification improves coterminosity between the divisions and district wards.

44 A local political party proposed an alternative division pattern which included Soberton parish in Meon Valley division and a modified Winchester Southern Parishes division. However, the alternative pattern resulted in a Winchester Southern Parishes division with a variance above 10%. We considered that the evidence submitted for this alternative pattern did not sufficiently justify why we should accept a high electoral variance. Elsewhere in Winchester City District, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

## Final recommendations

45 The tables on pages 12–44 detail our final recommendations for each district/borough of Hampshire. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

## Basingstoke & Deane Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Basingstoke Central</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the centre of Basingstoke.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received an alternative pattern of five divisions for Basingstoke. The five divisions were largely based on the existing district wards and were significantly different from our draft recommendations. We considered that one of the proposed divisions covering Buckskin and Winklebury did not result in a division boundary that would be clear and identifiable in the Buckskin area. It would also require arbitrarily dividing the Buckskin community in order to provide for divisions with good electoral equality. We are not persuaded that the alternative division pattern submitted provides for a better balance between the three statutory criteria. Therefore, we have decided not to move away from our five proposed divisions and confirm our draft recommendations for Basingstoke as final.
<b>Basingstoke North</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the South View and Popley areas of Basingstoke.	
<b>Basingstoke North West</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Rooksdown parish and the Buckskin and Winklebury areas of Basingstoke.	
<b>Basingstoke South East</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the Brighton Hill and Eastrop areas of Basingstoke.	
<b>Basingstoke South West</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the Hatch Warren and Kempshott areas of Basingstoke.	
<b>Calleva</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the parishes of Bramley, Hannington, Hartley Wespall, Monk Sherborne, Mortimer West End, Pamber, Sherborne St John, Silchester, Stratfield Saye, Stratfield Turgis, Wootton St Lawrence and	

			part of Sherfield on Loddon parish.	
<b>Candovers, Oakley &amp; Overton</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Bradley, Candovers, Cliddesden, Deane, Dummer, Ellisfield, Farleigh Wallop, Herriard, Laverstoke, North Waltham, Nutley, Oakley, Overton, Popham, Preston Candover, Steventon, Tunworth, Upton Grey, Weston Corbett, Weston Patrick and Winslade.	We received two submissions relating to Candovers division. A parish council supported being grouped in the division. A local resident proposed a change to the division name. They argued that Candovers does not form the major population in the division. It was proposed the division name should include Oakley and Overton as it would better reflect the communities which make up the division. We are persuaded by the evidence submitted and have decided to re-name the division Candovers, Oakley & Overton. We consider the name is a better reflection of communities and the geographical extent of the division. Subject to the change of division name, we confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
<b>Loddon</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the parishes of Chineham, Mapledurwell & Up Nately, Newnham, Old Basing & Lychpit and part of Sherfield on Loddon parish.	We received two submissions supporting our draft recommendations for Loddon division. There were no other comments relating to this division. We consider that our Loddon division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities, we therefore confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Tadley &amp; Baughurst</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashford Hill with Headley, Baughurst, Tadley and part of Ecchinswell, Sydmonton & Bishops Green parish.	We received two submissions relating to Tadley & Baughurst division. A parish council and local resident both proposed that Pamber Heath should be included in this division instead of Bishop's Green. To make this change would result in Calleva division with an electoral variance of 20%. We have not received any persuasive evidence to justify accepting such a high electoral variance for Calleva division. We consider our proposed division better reflects the three criteria and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.

<b>Whitchurch &amp; The Cleres</b>	1	0%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashmansworth, Burghclere East Woodhay, Highclere, Hurstbourne Priors, Kingsclere, Litchfield & Woodcott, Newtown, St Mary Bourne, Whitchurch and part of Ecchinswell, Sydmonton & Bishops Green parish.	The County Council proposed a minor change to the division name. It commented that the change would reflect the Burghclere, Highclere and Kingsclere areas grouped in this division. Based on the evidence received, we have re-named this division Whitchurch & The Cleres which we consider better reflects the communities within the division. We received no other comments relating to the division boundaries. Subject to the change of division name, we confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
------------------------------------	---	----	---	--

## East Hampshire District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Alton Rural</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the parishes of Beech, Bentley, Bentworth, Binsted, Chawton, Farringdon, Four Marks, Froyle, Kingsley, Lasham, Medstead, Newton Valence, Selborne, Shalden, Wield and Worldham.	<p>We received 20 submissions relating to Alton Rural and Alton Town divisions. The majority of respondents objected to our draft proposals which grouped five rural parishes with part of Alton. The County Council submitted an alternative division pattern which proposed to reduce the number of rural parishes included with Alton to two.</p> <p>We received evidence from a parish council that it and adjoining parishes share a distinct community identity from that of Alton. The parishes also share local community facilities rather than using facilities in Alton. Similar</p>
<b>Alton Town</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the entirety of Alton Town Council.	<p>comments from local councillors and local residents were also submitted. We also received objections from local residents in Holybourne Village who proposed the area should be included in Alton Town division. It was argued by local respondents that Holybourne has strong community links with Alton and has no association with the rural parishes that surround Alton. It was proposed by 11 respondents that the two divisions should be based on the existing division arrangements as it would be a better reflection of communities.</p> <p>We have decided that the proposal for an Alton Town division surrounded by an Alton Rural division is based on stronger community evidence than alternative proposals. Therefore, we have moved away from our draft recommendations. We have decided that these divisions should be named Alton Rural and Alton Town.</p>

<b>Catherington</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Horndean and Rowlands Castle.	We received two submissions supporting our draft recommendations relating to Catherington division. There were no other comments relating to this division. Therefore, we have decided to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Liphook, Headley &amp; Grayshott</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Bramshott & Liphook, Grayshott and Headley.	We received submissions from two parish councils which objected to our proposed division name of Headley & Liphook. The parishes proposed division names which reflected their respective communities. The proposed division names were markedly different from the other. After considering the evidence of both parish councils, we have decided to re-name the division Liphook, Headley & Grayshott. We consider this division name would better reflect the communities which make up this division. We are also satisfied this division provides for good electoral equality and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Petersfield Butser</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Buriton, Clanfield, East Meon and Langrish.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Petersfield Butser division. Therefore, we have decided to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Petersfield Hangers</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Colemore & Priors Dean, East Tisted, Froxfield & Privett, Greatham, Hawley, Liss, Ropley, Sheet, Steep, Stroud, West Tisted and the north of Petersfield parish.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Petersfield Hangers division. We are content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we have decided to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

<b>Whitehill, Bordon &amp; Lindford</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises the parishes of Lindford and Whitehill.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Whitehill, Bordon & Lindford division. We are content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we have decided to confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
---	---	-----	---	--

## Eastleigh Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bishopstoke &amp; Fair Oak</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises Bishopstoke parish and the northern half of Fair Oak.	We received two submissions relating to our proposed Bishopstoke & Fair Oak division. A local councillor and a parish council objected to Fair Oak being divided by divisions and proposed that all of the village be contained in a Bishopstoke & Fair Oak division. The boundary would move further to the south to run along Knowle Lane. We are unable to accept this modification when taking into consideration the wider pattern of divisions we propose for the borough. To make this change would result in an electoral variance of 26% for West End & Horton Heath division. We consider this too high an electoral variance and do not consider that persuasive evidence has been received to justify this variance and consequential boundary changes. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Bishopstoke & Fair Oak division as final. We consider this division provides a good balance between the statutory criteria.
<b>Botley &amp; Hedge End North</b>	1	-10%	This division comprises Botley parish and the north of Hedge End.	During consultation on our draft recommendations we received two submissions which objected to Botley parish being divided by divisions. We received an alternative division pattern for Botley which included all of the village in a division with part of Hedge End. The alternative division pattern was supported by respondents and was well-evidenced. We are persuaded this alternative division provides for a better reflection of communities in this part of the borough and have decided to include it as part of our final recommendations.

<b>Chandler's Ford</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of Chandler's Ford parish.	We received a submission objecting to Chandler's Ford being divided by divisions. It was argued that all of Chandler's Ford be included in a single division. To include more of the Chandler's Ford area between the borough border and M3 motorway would result in an electoral variance of 34%. We consider this too high an electoral variance. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Chandler's Ford division as final.
<b>Eastleigh North</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises the parish of Allbrook & North Boyatt and the north of Eastleigh.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Eastleigh North division. We are content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Eastleigh South</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the south-western part of Chandler's Ford parish and the south of Eastleigh.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Eastleigh South division. We are content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Hamble</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the parishes of Hamble-le-Rice, Hound and part of Bursledon parish to the south of the M27 motorway.	We received nine submissions relating to our proposed Hamble division. The majority of local residents, a parish council and the Borough Council proposed that that northern boundary of Hamble division should run along Peewit Hill, Peewit Hill Close and Pylands Lane. The County Council proposed the use of part of the M27 motorway as proposed in the draft recommendations for this division. After considering the evidence, we have decided that the motorway provides for a clearer and identifiable boundary. It also avoids an 11% electoral variance for Hedge End & West End South division if the boundary was moved north to Pylands Lane.

				<p>We received a submission which proposed to change the division name. We consider the evidence submitted was not persuasive to change the division name. The River Hamble is a strong geographical feature and we consider our proposed name unites the communities which sit along the river.</p> <p>As we have proposed no changes to our draft recommendations, we confirm Hamble division as final.</p>
<b>Hedge End &amp; West End South</b>	1	-10%	This division comprises the southern parts of Hedge End and West End.	<p>During consultation on the draft recommendations we received objections from the Borough Council, a parish council and a political group to our proposed two-member Hedge End &amp; West division. We received an alternative division pattern for Hedge End and West End which included parts of these areas in separate single-member divisions. The alternative division pattern was supported by respondents and community identity evidence. While the alternative division pattern divides West End between divisions, we are satisfied it is supported by respondents and based on local evidence. We have decided to modify our draft recommendations in this area and propose single-member Hedge End &amp; West End South and West End &amp; Horton Heath divisions as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>West End &amp; Horton Heath</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises the northern part of West End, the southern part of Fair Oak and Horton Heath.	

## Fareham Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Fareham Crofton</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the Hill Head and Stubbington areas which are located on the coast of the Solent. It also comprises a small area of Fareham Town.	We received an objection relating to our proposed Fareham Crofton division and its proposed name. It was argued that the division should not include part of Fareham between Longfield Avenue and The Avenue. However, not including this area in the division would result in an electoral variance of 16% fewer electors. We consider this too high an electoral variance. We therefore have decided not to modify the boundaries of this division. In terms of the division name, we consider that our proposed division name of Fareham Crofton is more reflective of the community which makes up the division. We are not persuaded by the alternative division name of Stubbington & Hill Head that was proposed. Therefore, we confirm our draft recommendations for Fareham Crofton division as final.
<b>Fareham Portchester</b>	1	2%	This division comprises the suburb of Portchester which is located between the M27 and Portsmouth Harbour.	We received two submissions objecting to our proposed division. Both respondents argued that residents to the west of Downend Road and Shearwater Avenue have no connection or ties with the remainder of Portchester. It was proposed that adjoining roads should be included in Fareham Town division. We consider that persuasive evidence was not received to suggest that the alternative pattern would better reflect community identities. Furthermore, the A27 and Delme Roundabout are a significant barrier between Fareham and Portchester areas. We have therefore decided not to move away from our draft recommendations and confirm our proposed Fareham Portchester division as final.

<b>Fareham Sarisbury</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the Burridge, Sarisbury and Swanwick areas. The division borders the River Hamble to the west.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Fareham Sarisbury division. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Fareham Titchfield</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises the Catisfield, Heathfield and Titchfield areas and part of Locks Heath.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received an alternative pattern of three divisions covering the Fareham and Titchfield areas. It was proposed that Fareham Town should be divided into two single-member divisions. One of these divisions would include part of Fareham Titchfield division between the railway line, Blackbrook Road and Blackbrook Park Avenue.
<b>Fareham Town</b>	2	-8%	This division comprises Fareham Town which is located at the north-west tip of Portsmouth Harbour.	We have considered the alternative pattern and have decided not to move away from our draft recommendations in this area. Our investigations of the alternative division pattern suggested that the Fareham Titchfield division would have an electoral variance of 17%. We consider this is not an acceptable level of electoral equality based on the evidence received. We also do not consider that the alternative pattern is a better reflection of community identities, in particular between Funtley and Wallington areas where there is no direct road access between them. We consider our draft recommendations provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria and therefore confirm our Fareham Titchfield and Fareham Town divisions as final.
<b>Fareham Warsash</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the Warsash area which is located at the mouth of the River Hamble and Titchfield Common to the east.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to our Fareham Warsash division. We consider this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

## Gosport Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bridgemary</b>	1	-3%	The Bridgemary area is on the borough boundary to the west and bounded by the A32 (Fareham Road) to the east.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to our Bridgemary division. We consider this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Hardway</b>	1	-6%	The Hardway area is bordered by Portsmouth Harbour to the east and the A32 (Brockhurst Road) to the west.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Hardway division. We consider this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Lee</b>	1	-6%	Lee is located on the coast of the Solent. It is primarily a residential area.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Lee division. We consider this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Leesland &amp; Town</b>	2	-8%	This division comprises the Alverstoke, Ann's Hill and Clayhall areas. These areas are located in the south of Gosport Borough.	<p>We received three submissions specifically relating to this division. One of the submissions proposed this division be divided into two single-member division. While these proposed divisions resulted in good electoral equality, we consider that evidence was not received detailing why the alternative pattern would better reflect community identities and provide for effective and convenient local government. We have also received a submission in support of our proposed division.</p> <p>We have transferred a number of electors to Leesland &amp; Town division following evidence received from a local</p>

				<p>councillor relating to a polling district. This results in no change to our proposed boundaries for this division and improves the electoral variance. The County Council proposed a minor modification between this division and Hardway division' however, we consider our recommendations provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria. We therefore propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Leesland &amp; Town division as final.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

## Hart District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Church Crookham &amp; Ewshot</b>	1	10%	This division comprises the parishes of Church Crookham and Ewshot and parts of Crookham Village and Fleet parishes.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to the boundaries of Church Crookham & Ewshot division. However, a parish council proposed that we consider changes to its parish warding arrangements that are within the division. The proposed changes to the parish wards were not as a direct consequence of our recommendations, therefore we are unable to propose the changes. We are also not persuaded to modify the division boundary to include Wickham Road parish wards in Fleet Town division. We do not consider the evidence sufficiently justifies an electoral variance of 12% that would result. We propose to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.
<b>Fleet Town</b>	1	10%	This division comprises the majority of Fleet parish, and parts of Crookham Village and Elvetham Heath parishes.	We received 10 submissions relating to Fleet Town division. Nine respondents objected to our proposals which divided Elvetham Heath parish between divisions and argued that it would divide a cohesive community. The respondents proposed that Pondtail parish ward in Fleet parish should instead be divided between divisions. Although the evidence from respondents proposed that Pondtail parish ward be divided, it did not specify exactly where the division boundary should be drawn. Furthermore, the Pondtail area is densely populated, with no clear and identifiable ground feature by which to draw the division boundary. We are also unable to propose a two-member division covering Blackwater, Fleet and East Yateley as it would be geographically large and is not supported by evidence received. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

<b>Hartley Wintney &amp; Yateley West</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the parishes of Bramshill, Dogmersfield, Eversley, Hartley Wintney, Heckfield, Mattingley and Winchfield parishes and part of Yateley parish.	We received support for our draft recommendations relating to Hartley Wintney & Yateley West division. We also received three submissions which proposed to include Dogsmerfield parish in Odiham & Hook division. This change would result in electoral variances of 10% and 7% for Odiham & Hook and Hartley Wintney & Yateley West divisions, respectively. After considering the evidence received, we have decided not to move away from our draft recommendations. On balance, we consider our proposed divisions provide for better electoral equality by 2021 and overall provide for a better balance between the three statutory criteria. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Hartley Wintney & Yateley West and Odiham & Hook divisions as final.
<b>Odiham &amp; Hook</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Crondall, Greywell, Hook, Long Sutton, Odiham, Rotherwick and South Warnborough.	
<b>Yateley East &amp; Blackwater</b>	1	8%	This division comprises Blackwater & Hawley parish and parts of Elvetham Heath, Fleet and Yateley parishes.	We received four submissions relating to this division. Two of the submissions commented on the parish warding arrangements for Yateley. We have considered the evidence and provided for revised parish electoral arrangements for Yateley at page 47 of this report. The remaining submissions commented on the division name. It was argued that Blackwater be included in the name as it would better reflect the communities which make up the division. We are persuaded by the evidence received; however, we consider a division name consisting of Fleet North, Yateley East & Blackwater to be too long. As Blackwater and Yateley make up a significant part of the division, we have re-named the division Yateley East & Blackwater which we consider better reflects communities represented in this division. Subject to this change of division name, we confirm our recommended division as part of our final recommendations.

## Havant Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Cowplain &amp; Hart Plain</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the Cowplain area and part of Waterlooville. These areas are in the north-west of the borough.	During consultation on the draft and further draft recommendations we did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this division. We consider Cowplain & Hart Plain division reflects the three statutory criteria and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Emsworth &amp; St Faiths</b>	1	8%		<p>We received a submission from a residents' association which objected to Denvilles divided between two divisions. An alternative divisions pattern covering Denvilles and Emsworth was submitted by a political group.</p> <p>During the consultation on our further draft recommendations, we received a mixture of support and objection from respondents to our proposed Havant Coastal ward. However, the resulting polling district allocation error discovered in our proposed Havant Central division would have resulted in consequential changes to Havant Coastal division. We consider that any further deviation from our further draft recommendations would not be based on supporting evidence. However, our draft recommendations received support from the County Council, MP for Havant and local residents. We are content that our draft recommendations reflect community identities and provide for good electoral equality. Therefore, we propose to confirm Emsworth &amp; St Faiths division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Hayling Island</b>	1	8%	This division comprises an island of the same name and is linked to Havant	During consultation on the draft and further draft recommendations we did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this division. We consider our Hayling

			borough by Langstone Bridge.	Island division reflects the three statutory criteria and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>North East Havant</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the West Leigh area. It is bordered to the east by the borough boundary.	<p>During the consultation on our further draft recommendations, we received a mixture of support and objection from respondents. Some respondents argued that our proposals arbitrarily divided communities in central Havant between divisions. However, some respondents argued that further draft recommendations reflected community identities in central Havant.</p> <p>The result of the polling district allocation error we discovered for Havant Central division resulted in Havant Central division with an electoral variance of 18%. We consider that any further deviation from our further draft recommendations would not be based on supporting evidence. However, our draft recommendations received support from the County Council, MP for Havant and local residents. It was argued by respondents that the draft recommendations provided for greater coterminosity with borough wards and reflected community identities in Havant. We are content that our draft recommendations provide for good electoral equality. Therefore, we propose to confirm North East Havant and North West Havant as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>North West Havant</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the Bedhampton area. It is bordered to the west by the A3(M).	
<b>Purbrook &amp; Stakes South</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the Purbrook area in the south-west of Havant Borough.	<p>We received one submission during the draft recommendations consultation. A respondent commented that our proposed division would cross over two parliamentary constituencies. We do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries in an electoral review.</p>
<b>Waterloo &amp; Stakes North</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the Waterlooville area and is situated between the	

			borough border and the A3(M).	During the further limited consultation, we did not receive any submissions relating to both divisions. We consider Purbrook & Stakes South and Waterloo & Stakes North divisions reflect the three statutory criteria and confirm both as part of our final recommendations.
--	--	--	-------------------------------	---

## New Forest District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Brockenhurst</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the parishes of Ashurst & Colbury, Beaulieu, Bransgore, Brockenhurst, Burley, Denny Lodge, East Boldre, Exbury & Lepe, Sway and part of New Milton parish.	<p>In response to our draft recommendations we received six submissions. All respondents were opposed to this division. Two parish councils objected to being divided between divisions and another parish preferred to be included in Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division. Respondents also commented on the size of the division, suggesting it was too large to effectively represent communities in the New Forest National Park. The County and District Councils proposed a significantly different Brockenhurst division from our draft recommendations. We considered the County Council's proposals would best reflect community identities and used it as the basis of our further draft recommendations, subject to not including Exbury &amp; Lepe parish in South Waterside division.</p> <p>We received 15 submissions in response to further draft limited consultation. Three parish councils and several local respondents supported our proposals to group Bransgore, Burley and Exbury &amp; Lepe parishes in this division. Local respondents in Boldre also preferred that Boldre parish was included in Brockenhurst division.</p> <p>We received objections from local respondents to the inclusion of part of New Milton parish in Brockenhurst division. However, after considering the submissions received, we have decided not to change our proposals for Brockenhurst division. The changes proposed would result in a high level of electoral inequality, as the division would have 20% more electors than the county average by 2021. Our proposed division provides for the best reflection of the three</p>

				statutory criteria and we confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Dibden &amp; Hythe</b>	1	4%	Dibden and Hythe are located by the shore of Southampton Water. The division comprises the majority of Hythe & Dibden parish.	<p>We received three submissions in response to our draft recommendations. A parish council proposed that the division boundary be amended to include Furzedown in Dibden &amp; Hythe division. The County Council and District Council proposed to retain the existing division as proposed in the draft recommendations.</p> <p>We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this division during the further draft recommendations consultation. We also do not consider the above proposal of the parish council balances the three statutory criteria. To include Furzedown in Dibden &amp; Hythe division would result in an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality. Our further draft recommendations provide for a better balance of the criteria and we confirm Dibden &amp; Hythe division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Lymington &amp; Boldre</b>	1	7%	This division comprises the parishes of Boldre and Lymington & Pennington parishes.	<p>In response to our draft recommendations we received four submissions. One respondent in Lymington supported our proposed division and three in Boldre objected to our draft recommendations.</p> <p>We received nine submissions during the further limited consultation. A mixture of support and objection was received. Respondents in Lymington supported our proposals and respondents in Boldre objected to it. It was proposed by Boldre respondents that Boldre parish should be transferred to Brockenhurst division. However, we consider persuasive evidence was received from a local councillor to include Lymington and Boldre in the same division. Therefore, we do not propose any changes to</p>

				Lymington & Boldre division and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge</b>	1	8%	This comprises the parishes of Bramshaw, Breamore, Copythorne, Damerham, Ellingham Harbridge & Ibsley, Fordingbridge, Godshill, Hale, Hyde, Lyndhurst, Martin, Minstead, Rockbourne, Sandleheath, Whitsbury and Woodgreen.	<p>We received 12 submissions during consultation on the draft recommendations. All respondents were opposed to this division. Several parishes either objected to being divided by the Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division boundary or preferred to be included in this division. The County and District Councils proposed an alternative Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division which was different from the draft recommendations. We used this proposal as the basis of our further limited consultation.</p> <p>We received 36 submissions during the further limited consultation. The majority of respondents proposed that Hyde parish should be included in Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division. We considered the evidence received from respondents persuasively argued that Hyde parish has strong community identities with Fordingbridge. Therefore, we have amended our proposals to include Hyde parish in Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division. However, we do not consider that including Ellingham, Harbridge &amp; Ibsley parish in this division would be the best balance of the three statutory criteria as it would result in a high level of electoral inequality. Subject to the inclusion of Hyde parish, we confirm our further draft recommendations for Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>New Milton</b>	1	5%	Barton-on-Sea and New Milton comprise this division. The division is located on the shore of Christchurch Bay.	We received six submissions during consultation on the draft recommendations. The majority of respondents were opposed to the boundary following the railway line in the north of the division. We also received an alternative division pattern covering this division and neighbouring Milford & Hordle division. We did not make the proposed changes as

				<p>the alternative pattern resulted in poor electoral equality and did not provide for effective and convenient local government. The County and District councils proposed no change from the existing division arrangements.</p> <p>We received two submissions during the further limited consultations specifically relating to New Milton division. It was proposed by respondents that either Bashley or Bransgore be included in New Milton. However, both areas are far too large in electorate to be included in New Milton division. We consider our proposed division reflects the three statutory criteria and uses clear division boundaries. We propose no changes to the division and confirm it as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>New Milton North, Milford &amp; Hordle</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Hordle and Milford-on-Sea and part of New Milton parish.	<p>We received six submissions during consultation on the draft recommendations. The majority of respondents proposed that all of Bashley ward be included in Milford &amp; Hordle division. We also received an alternative division pattern for this division from a local resident. We did not make the proposed changes as the alternative pattern resulted in poor electoral equality and did not provide for effective and convenient local government. The County Council proposed to include a greater part of Bashley ward in this division. This change along with changes in adjoining Brockenhurst division provided for a better reflection of community identities. We adopted the County Council proposals as part of our further limited consultation.</p> <p>We received four submissions during the further limited consultation. Two respondents reiterated that all of Bashley ward be included in Milford &amp; Hordle division. However, to make this change would result in a Milford &amp; Hordle division with 16% more electors than the county average, which we</p>

				<p>consider to be a high level of electoral inequality. Overall, we consider our proposed division is the best balance of the statutory criteria.</p> <p>Two respondents also proposed a division name change. We consider the division name of New Milton North, Milford &amp; Hordle better reflects community identities because our proposals have taken in a greater part of New Milton. Therefore, we have changed the name of the division. Subject to this change, we confirm our further draft recommendations for New Milton North, Milford &amp; Hordle division as final.</p>
<b>Ringwood</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley, Ringwood and Sopley.	<p>We received five submissions during consultation on the draft recommendations. Three parish councils objected to our draft recommendations for Ringwood division. The County and District councils also proposed a significantly different Ringwood division from that proposed in the draft recommendations. We considered the County Council's proposals better supported the views of local respondents and used it as the basis of our further limited consultation.</p> <p>We received 35 submissions during the further limited consultation. The majority of respondents were against Hyde parish being included in Ringwood division. It was argued that Hyde parish has stronger community links with Fordingbridge rather than Ringwood. We considered the evidence received from respondents to be persuasive and have therefore included Hyde parish in Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division.</p> <p>Three respondents proposed that Ellingham, Harbridge &amp; Ibsley parish be transferred to Lyndhurst &amp; Fordingbridge division. However, this further change would result in a</p>

				Ringwood division with 12% more electors than the average by 2021. We have not received persuasive evidence to accept this level of electoral inequality. Subject to the change relating to Hyde parish, we confirm our further draft recommendations for Ringwood division as final.
<b>South Waterside</b>	1	-9%	This division comprises Fawley parish and part of Hythe & Dibden parish. The division is located at the foot of Southampton water.	<p>In response to our draft recommendations we received five submissions. A parish council proposed Furzedown be transferred to Dibden &amp; Hythe division. The County Council and District Council proposed to include Exbury &amp; Lepe parish in South Waterside division. However, two respondents, including a parish council, argued against this proposal.</p> <p>We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this division during the further draft recommendations consultation. However, we consider Exbury &amp; Lepe parish has stronger community identities with parishes in Brockenhurst division and proposed that it remains there. We do not consider the transfer of Furzedown to Dibden &amp; Hythe division would balance the three statutory criteria because South Waterside division would have an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality, with 21% more electors than average by 2021. We consider that our further draft recommendations provide for a better balance of the criteria and we confirm South Waterside division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Totton North &amp; Netley Marsh</b>	1	6%	This division comprises the northern part of Totton and Netley Marsh parish.	In response to our draft recommendations we received four submissions. A parish council objected to Copythorne parish being divided by Totton North division. A councillor also objected to Netley Marsh parish being divided by this division boundary as well. The County Council and District

				<p>Council both proposed a Totton North division which was different from the draft recommendations.</p> <p>During the further limited consultation, a parish council commented that it supported not being divided between divisions, instead preferring to be grouped in a division with Ashurst &amp; Colbury parish. To accept this proposal would result in Brockenhurst division having 22% more electors than the county average by 2021. We do not consider this change would be the best balance of the three statutory criteria between divisions.</p> <p>The District Council proposed a division name change which we considered to better reflect community identities. Therefore, we have amended the name of the division to Totton North &amp; Netley Marsh. We also confirm the division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
<b>Totton South &amp; Marchwood</b>	1	0%	This division comprises Marchwood parish and the southern part of Totton & Eling parish.	<p>The County Council and District Council proposed no changes to the draft recommendations for Totton South &amp; Marchwood division.</p> <p>We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to our proposals during the further limited consultation. We are satisfied this division reflects community identities and provides for good electoral equality and confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>

## Rushmoor Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Aldershot North</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises a large part of Aldershot, to the north and east of the railway line.	We received five submissions in support of and two objections to, our draft recommendations for Aldershot. Four respondents proposed a change in the name of these two divisions to better reflect their geographical location. We are persuaded by the evidence received and have decided to re-name the divisions Aldershot North and Aldershot South. While we note that two respondents objected to North Town district ward being divided between the Aldershot divisions, we are unable to include all of the ward in a single division as it would result in electoral variances above 10%. Subject to this change of division name, we confirm both divisions as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Aldershot South</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises a large part of Aldershot, to the south of the railway line.	
<b>Farnborough North</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises the Hawley Lane and Fox Lane areas. The M3 motorway passes through the centre of the division.	We received two submissions which proposed modifications to our proposals for Farnborough North division. One of the respondents objected to our proposals which included Middleton Gardens, Newfield Road and part of Fernhill Road in our Farnborough West division. It was proposed that the boundary be modified to include these roads in Farnborough North division. The other respondent proposed a modification which included a larger part of Farnborough North division in Farnborough West division. After considering the evidence, we have decided to modify our draft recommendations. Under our final recommendations we have decided to include Middleton Gardens, Newfield Road and part of Fernhill Road in our Farnborough North division. We consider this would better reflect community identities in this part of Farnborough. We have also accepted a modification which includes Samuel Cody Sports College in Farnborough North division to avoid the division boundary

				running along the College's road access. Overall, we consider these modifications better reflect the statutory criteria and have included them as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Farnborough South</b>	1	3%	This division comprises Farnborough Airport, Farnborough Park and South Farnborough.	We received support for our proposed Farnborough South division. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Farnborough West</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the Southwood and West Heath areas.	As mentioned above in the Farnborough North section of this report, we have included Middleton Gardens, Newfield Road, Samuel Cody Sports College and part of Fernhill Road in Farnborough North division as we consider it would better reflect the statutory criteria. Subject to this modification we confirm the remainder of our Farnborough West division as part of our final recommendations.

## Test Valley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Andover North</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Enham Alamein, Faccombe, Hurstbourne Tarrant, Linkenholt, Smannell, Tangley, Vernhams Dean and parts of Andover Town parish both to the north and south of the railway line.	<p>We received three submissions relating to Andover and the surrounding parishes. One of the submissions proposed an alternative pattern of five divisions covering Andover and the north, centre and south of Test Valley Borough. It was argued that this alternative division pattern would better reflect community identities, particularly in Andover. While the alternative Andover North, Andover South and Andover West divisions appeared to reflect the three statutory criteria, it required accepting Romsey Rural and Test Valley Central divisions with an electoral variance of 12% and 13%, respectively. We do not consider the evidence submitted was persuasive to support these levels of electoral inequality. Therefore, we have decided not to make these modifications in our final recommendations.</p> <p>We also received a submission which proposed an alternative council size and parish warding arrangements for Andover Town Council. Firstly, we are not inclined to reduce the number of parish councillors for Andover as we have not received evidence from the Town Council supporting this and this would be matter for the Borough Council by way of a Community Governance Review. Secondly, the pattern for single-member parish wards would cross existing borough wards. When we create parish wards, we must have regard to both county divisions and borough wards so that parish wards do not cross either of these boundaries. For these reasons, we consider that these matters could be addressed by a Community Governance Review.</p>
<b>Andover South</b>	1	7%	The majority of this division comprises parts of Andover Town parish to the south of the railway line.	
<b>Andover West</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Amport Appleshaw, Charlton, Fyfield, Grateley, Kimpton, Monxton, Penton Grafton, Penton Mewsey, Quarley, Shipton Bellinger, Thruxton and part of Andover parish to the west of the railway line.	

				In Andover, a respondent objected to the Alamein area being divided along the A343 road. It was proposed the boundary should run along the River Anton which would keep Alamein in an Andover North division. We have carefully considered the evidence received and have decided not to move away from our draft recommendations. On balance, we consider our draft recommendations in this area would better reflect the statutory criteria. As we have not modified our draft recommendations of Andover North, Andover South and Andover West divisions, we confirm the divisions as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Baddesley</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Ampfield, Braishfield, North Baddesley and Valley Park.	We received three submissions specially relating to this division. Two respondents supported our draft recommendations regarding the Baddesley and Valley Park areas. The other respondent requested an amendment to the borough boundary; however, this is outside the scope of this review. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Romsey Rural</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Awbridge Buckholt, Chilworth, East Dean, East Tytherley, Frenchmoor, Lockerley, Melchet Park & Plaitford, Michelmersh & Timsbury, Nursling & Rownhams, Sherfield English, Wellow, West Tytherley and the majority of Romsey Extra parish.	We received 11 submissions specifically relating to this division. One of the respondents supported our draft recommendations regarding Chilworth parish. However, 10 respondents objected to part of Romsey Extra parish, in particular, the Crampmoor area being included in Romsey Town division. It was proposed by respondents that this area be included in our Romsey Rural division. We are persuaded that the evidence received is persuasive and that the modification would reflect the community links that Crampmoor has with the rest of Romsey Extra parish. Therefore, we have moved away from our draft recommendations and included Crampmoor in our Romsey

				Rural division. Subject to the transfer of Mottisfont parish to Test Valley Central division (see below), we confirm our proposed Romsey Rural division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Romsey Town</b>	1	3%	This division comprises Romsey Town and part of Romsey Extra parish.	As mentioned above we modified our draft recommendations to include the Crampmoor area in Romsey Rural division. We did not receive any other submissions specifically relating to Romsey Town division. We are content that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Subject to the modification we have made regarding Crampmoor, we confirm our Romsey Town division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Test Valley Central</b>	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Abbots Ann, Ashley, Barton Stacey, Bossington, Broughton, Bullington, Chilbolton, Goodworth Clatford, Houghton, Kings Somborne, Leckford, Little Somborne, Longparish, Longstock, Mottisfont, Nether Wallop, Over Wallop, Stockbridge, Upper Clatford and Wherwell.	We received three submissions relating to this division. One of the submissions proposed an alternative division pattern for Test Valley Central. However, it resulted in an electoral variance of 13%. We do not consider the evidence is persuasive to support this level of electoral imbalance. The other submission contained comments from local councillors, one of whom supported our draft recommendations regarding Kings Somborne parish. We also received a submission from a parish council to transfer Mottisfont parish to Test Valley Central division. We are persuaded that the evidence received has identified the community links Mottisfont parish has with the other parishes in our proposed Test Valley Central division. Subject to this modification, we confirm our Test Valley Central division as final.

## Winchester City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Bishops Waltham</b>	1	0%	This division comprises of parishes of Beauworth, Bishops Sutton, Bishops Waltham, Brandean & Hinton Ampner, Cheriton, Colden Common, Durley, Kilmiston, Owslebury, Tichborne, Twyford and Upham.	We received two submissions which supported our draft recommendations regarding Durley and Upham parishes. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Itchen Valley</b>	1	6%	This division comprises of parishes of Bighton, Chilcomb, Headbourne Worthy, Itchen Stoke & Ovington, Itchen Valley, Kings Worthy, Micheldever, New Alresford, Northington, Old Alresford and Wonston.	We received three submissions specifically relating to this division. Two respondents supported our draft recommendations. The other respondents made general comments about the roles and responsibilities of councillors in the district. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Meon Valley</b>	1	3%	This division comprises of parishes of Corhampton & Meonstoke, Curdrige, Droxford, Exton, Hambledon, Shedfield, Swanmore, Warnford, West Meon and Whiteley.	We received six submissions specifically relating to this division. A respondent supported our draft recommendations regarding the inclusion of Shedfield parish in this division. One of the submissions proposed an alternative division pattern covering this division and the adjoining Winchester Southern Parishes division. While the alternative Meon Valley division would result in a good level of electoral equality, it would result in significant consequential changes to neighbouring divisions including a Winchester Southern Parishes division with a variance of 17%. We consider that

				<p>evidence has not been received to justify this level of electoral imbalance. Due to the consequential changes required as part of the alternative Meon Valley proposal, we do not recommend this alternative pattern as part of our final recommendations, as we consider that not all the changes are supported by evidence.</p> <p>Four respondents commented on our proposals for Whiteley. Two respondents requested an amendment to the district boundary near Whiteley; however, this is outside the scope of this review. The two other respondents proposed that Whiteley be included in Winchester Southern Parishes division; however, this would result in an electoral variance of 15% for Meon Valley division which is too high an electoral variance.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Meon Valley division as final, subject to a boundary change regarding Soberton parish (see below). We consider that this division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.</p>
<b>Winchester Downlands</b>	1	6%	This division comprises of parishes of Badger Farm, Compton & Shawford, Crawley, Hursley, Littleton & Harestock, Olivers Battery, Otterbourne, South Wonston, Sparsholt and part of Winchester.	We received two submissions which supported our draft recommendations regarding Otterbourne and Shawford parishes. A respondent requested an amendment to the borough boundary; however, this is outside the scope of this review. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Winchester Eastgate</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the Royal Hampshire County Hospital, University of	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Winchester Eastgate division. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community

			Winchester and parts of Winchester to the east and west of the railway line.	identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Winchester Southern Parishes</b>	1	6%	This division comprises of parishes of Boarhunt, Denmead, Soberton, Southwick & Widley and Wickham.	We received six submissions specially relating to this division. One of the submissions proposed an alternative division pattern for this area. However, as has been mentioned above in the Meon Valley section this would result in an electoral variance of 17% for our Winchester Southern Parishes division. We consider this is too high an electoral variance to accept. Five respondents objected to our draft proposals which divided Soberton parish between two divisions. The evidence received has persuaded us to move away from our draft recommendations and include all of Soberton parish in this division. We are satisfied that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, subject to this modification, we confirm our Winchester Southern Parishes division as part of our final recommendations.
<b>Winchester Westgate</b>	1	6%	This division comprises parts of Winchester that straddle the east and west of the railway line.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to Winchester Westgate division. We consider that this division provides for good electoral equality and reflects community identities. Therefore, we confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.

## Conclusions

46 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2021
Number of councillors	78	78
Number of electoral divisions	76	76
Average number of electors per councillor	13,080	13,846
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	22	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	4	0

### **Final recommendation**

Hampshire County Council should comprise 78 councillors serving 74 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Hampshire. **You can also view our draft recommendations for Hampshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

## Parish electoral arrangements

47 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 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.

48 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 division arrangements. However, the district and borough councils in Hampshire have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to

parish electoral arrangements.

49 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Andover, Bursledon, Ecchinswell, Sydmonton & Bishops Green, Elvetham Heath, Fair Oak & Horton Heath, Fleet, New Milton, Romsey Extra, West End and Yateley parishes.

50 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Andover parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Andover Town Council should return 19 town councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Alamein East (returning two members), Alamein West (returning one member), Andover Down (returning one member), Harroway (returning three members), Millway (returning three members), St Mary’s East (returning three members), St Mary’s West (returning two members) and Winton (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

51 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bursledon parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Bursledon Parish Council should return 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bursledon North (returning one member) and Bursledon South (returning 11 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

52 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ecchinswell, Sydmonton & Bishops Green parish.

**Final recommendation**  
Ecchinswell, Sydmonton & Bishops Green Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bishops Green (returning four members) and Ecchinswell (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

53 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Elvetham Heath parish.

**Final recommendation**

Elvetham Heath Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Elvetham East (returning three members) and Elvetham West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

54 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Fair Oak & Horton Heath parish.

**Final recommendation**

Fair Oak & Horton Heath Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: North (returning five members), South (returning seven members), Stoke Heights (returning one member) and West (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

55 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Fleet parish.

**Final recommendation**

Fleet Town Council should return 19 town councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Ancells (returning two members), Calthorpe (returning three members), Central (returning six members), Court Manor (returning one member), Courtmoor (returning two members), Pondtail (returning four members) and Wickham Road (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

56 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for New Milton parish.

**Final recommendation**

New Milton Town Council should return 18 town councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Barton (returning four members), Bashley North (returning one member), Bashley South (returning one member), Becton (returning four members), Fernhill (returning four members) and Milton (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

57 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Romsey Extra parish.

**Final recommendation**

Romsey Extra Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Romsey Extra (returning four members) and Woodley (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

58 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for West End parish.

**Final recommendation**

West End Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Allington (returning two members), Chartwell (returning three members), Hatch Grange (returning two members), Kanes Hill (returning one member), Moorgreen (returning three members), St James (returning two members) and Telegraph Woods (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

59 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Yateley parish.

**Final recommendation**

Yateley Town Council should return 13 town councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Darby Green & Potley Hill (returning two members), Frogmore (returning two members), Tudor & Vigo (returning three members), Yateley Green (returning three members), Yateley North (returning one member) and Yateley Village (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

60 We have now completed our review of Hampshire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

#### Equalities

61 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.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
Basingstoke & Deane Borough								
1	Basingstoke Central	1	13,758	13,758	5%	14,464	14,464	4%
2	Basingstoke North	1	12,253	12,253	-6%	14,306	14,306	3%
3	Basingstoke North West	1	12,391	12,391	-5%	14,398	14,398	4%
4	Basingstoke South East	1	14,846	14,846	13%	14,956	14,956	8%
5	Basingstoke South West	1	15,443	15,443	18%	14,981	14,981	8%
6	Calleva	1	10,144	10,144	-22%	12,534	12,534	-9%
7	Candovers, Oakley & Overton	1	11,823	11,823	-10%	12,986	12,986	-6%
8	Loddon	1	14,453	14,453	10%	14,659	14,659	6%
9	Tadley & Baughurst	1	12,683	12,683	-3%	12,693	12,693	-8%
10	Whitchurch & The Cleres	1	13,350	13,350	2%	13,907	13,907	0%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

Division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
East Hampshire District								
11	Alton Rural	1	12,148	12,148	-7%	12,640	12,640	-9%
12	Alton Town	1	12,780	12,780	-2%	14,578	14,578	5%
13	Catherington	1	11,946	11,946	-9%	13,071	13,071	-6%
14	Liphook, Headley & Grayshott	1	12,608	12,608	-4%	12,952	12,952	-6%
15	Petersfield Butser	1	12,537	12,537	-4%	13,104	13,104	-5%
16	Petersfield Hangers	1	12,963	12,963	-1%	13,232	13,232	-4%
17	Whitehill, Bordon & Lindford	1	9,940	9,940	-24%	12,901	12,901	-7%
Eastleigh Borough								
18	Bishopstoke & Fair Oak	1	11,812	11,812	-10%	12,934	12,934	-7%
19	Botley & Hedge End North	1	11,576	11,576	-11%	12,514	12,514	-10%
20	Chandler's Ford	1	12,097	12,097	-8%	12,540	12,540	-9%
21	Eastleigh North	1	11,608	11,608	-11%	12,816	12,816	-7%
22	Eastleigh South	1	14,129	14,129	8%	14,738	14,738	6%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Hamble	1	13,653	13,653	4%	14,248	14,248	3%
24	Hedge End & West End South	1	11,941	11,941	-9%	12,522	12,522	-10%
25	West End & Horton Heath	1	10,067	10,067	-23%	12,656	12,656	-9%
<b>Fareham Borough</b>								
26	Fareham Crofton	1	13,290	13,290	2%	13,225	13,225	-4%
27	Fareham Portchester	1	14,491	14,491	11%	14,117	14,117	2%
28	Fareham Sarisbury	1	12,045	12,045	-8%	13,475	13,475	-3%
29	Fareham Titchfield	1	12,985	12,985	-1%	12,977	12,977	-6%
30	Fareham Town	2	22,573	11,287	-14%	25,513	12,757	-8%
31	Fareham Warsash	1	13,755	13,755	5%	13,669	13,669	-1%
<b>Gosport Borough</b>								
32	Bridgemaury	1	13,957	13,957	7%	13,488	13,488	-3%
33	Hardway	1	12,943	12,943	-1%	12,962	12,962	-6%
34	Lee	1	12,072	12,072	-8%	13,008	13,008	-6%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
35	Leesland & Town	2	23,404	11,702	-11%	25,569	12,785	-8%
Hart District								
36	Church Crookham & Ewshot	1	13,655	13,655	4%	15,162	15,162	10%
37	Fleet Town	1	14,304	14,304	9%	15,200	15,200	10%
38	Hartley Wintney & Yateley West	1	14,849	14,849	14%	15,033	15,033	9%
39	Odiham & Hook	1	12,851	12,851	-2%	14,905	14,905	8%
40	Yateley East & Blackwater	1	15,030	15,030	15%	14,950	14,950	8%
Havant Borough								
41	Cowplain & Hart Plain	1	12,405	12,405	-5%	12,713	12,713	-8%
42	Emsworth & St Faiths	1	13,164	13,164	1%	14,991	14,991	8%
43	Hayling Island	1	14,235	14,235	9%	15,004	15,004	8%
44	North East Havant	1	14,320	14,320	9%	15,081	15,081	9%
45	North West Havant	1	14,364	14,364	10%	14,698	14,698	6%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
46	Purbrook & Stakes South	1	12,523	12,523	-4%	12,726	12,726	-8%
47	Waterloo & Stakes North	1	12,948	12,948	-1%	13,349	13,349	-4%
<b>New Forest District</b>								
48	Brockenhurst	1	14,951	14,951	14%	15,083	15,083	9%
49	Dibden & Hythe	1	14,640	14,640	12%	14,371	14,371	4%
50	Lymington & Boldre	1	13,971	13,971	7%	14,749	14,749	7%
51	Lyndhurst & Fordingbridge	1	14,789	14,789	13%	14,981	14,981	8%
52	New Milton	1	14,037	14,037	7%	14,511	14,511	5%
53	New Milton North, Milford & Hordle	1	14,953	14,953	14%	15,006	15,006	8%
54	Ringwood	1	12,859	12,859	-2%	13,121	13,121	-5%
55	South Waterside	1	12,728	12,728	-3%	12,602	12,602	-9%
56	Totton North & Netley Marsh	1	14,747	14,747	13%	14,705	14,705	6%
57	Totton South & Marchwood	1	14,223	14,223	9%	13,781	13,781	0%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
<b>Rushmoor Borough</b>								
58	Aldershot North	1	10,342	10,342	-21%	13,773	13,773	-1%
59	Aldershot South	1	13,517	13,517	3%	13,551	13,551	-2%
60	Farnborough North	1	13,552	13,552	4%	13,464	13,464	-3%
61	Farnborough South	1	13,999	13,999	7%	14,248	14,248	3%
62	Farnborough West	1	13,893	13,893	6%	12,761	12,761	-8%
<b>Test Valley Borough</b>								
63	Andover North	1	10,655	10,655	-19%	13,349	13,349	-4%
64	Andover South	1	14,069	14,069	8%	14,809	14,809	7%
65	Andover West	1	14,693	14,693	12%	15,005	15,005	8%
66	Baddesley	1	13,159	13,159	1%	12,793	12,793	-8%
67	Romsey Rural	1	13,645	13,645	4%	14,523	14,523	5%
68	Romsey Town	1	13,172	13,172	1%	14,235	14,235	3%
69	Test Valley Central	1	13,529	13,529	3%	14,118	14,118	2%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Hampshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
Winchester City								
70	Bishops Waltham	1	13,755	13,755	5%	13,839	13,839	0%
71	Itchen Valley	1	12,905	12,905	-1%	14,615	14,615	6%
72	Meon Valley	1	12,131	12,131	-7%	14,227	14,227	3%
73	Winchester Downlands	1	15,061	15,061	15%	14,678	14,678	6%
74	Winchester Eastgate	1	13,468	13,468	3%	14,593	14,593	5%
75	Winchester Southern Parishes	1	11,476	11,476	-12%	14,649	14,649	6%
76	Winchester Westgate	1	12,245	12,245	-6%	14,714	14,714	6%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>78</b>	<b>1,020,276</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,079,999</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,080</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>13,846</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Hampshire County Council.

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

# Appendix B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/hampshire/hampshire-county-council>

### Local authority

- Hampshire County Council

### District councils

- Eastleigh Borough Council
- New Forest District Council
- Rushmoor Borough Council
- Test Valley Borough Council
- Winchester City Council

### Political groups and parties

- Fareham Liberal Democrats
- Hampshire County Council Liberal Democrats
- Havant Liberal Democrats
- Meon Valley Liberal Democrats
- New Forest Constituency Labour Party

### Local organisations

- Alamein Community Association
- Botley Parish Action Group
- Bursledon Rights of Way & Amenities Preservation Group
- Holybourne Village Association
- New Forest Business Partnership
- Police and Crime Commissioner for Hampshire
- Warblington & Denvilles Residents' Association

### County and district councillors

- Councillor V. Achwal (Winchester City Council)
- Councillor J. Branson (Havant Borough Council)
- Councillor P. Chegwyn (Hampshire County Council and Gosport Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Collett (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor P. Crerar (Rushmoor Borough Council)
- Councillor N. Cutler (Winchester City Council)
- Councillor K. Dibble (Rushmoor Borough Council)

- Councillor M. Grantham (Eastleigh Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Harris (New Forest District Council)
- Councillor R. Huxstep (Hampshire County Council and Winchester City Council)
- Councillor R. Hylands (Gosport Borough Council)
- Councillor G. James (Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Joy<sup>4</sup> (Hampshire County Council and East Hampshire District Council)
- Councillor L. Keeble (Fareham Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Kemp-Gee (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor M. Lyon (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor K. Mans (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor A. Newell (Rushmoor Borough Council)
- Councillor S. Parker (Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council)
- Councillor R. Perry (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor J. Porter Hampshire County Council
- Councillor R. Price Hampshire County Council and Fareham Borough Council
- Councillor A. W. Rice (Hampshire County Council and New Forest District Council)
- Councillor B. Thomas (Rushmoor Borough Council)
- Councillor K. Thornber (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor D. Tipp (New Forest District Council)
- Councillor J. Wall (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor V. Weston (Winchester City Council)
- Councillor C. Wood (Hampshire County Council and Fareham Borough Council)
- Councillor P. Wyeth (New Forest District Council)

### **Parish councillors**

- Councillor C. Ecclestone (Andover Town Council)

### **Parish and town councils**

- Alton Town Council
- Andover Town Council
- Ashurst & Colbury Parish Council
- Bealieu Parish Council
- Bishopstoke Parish Council
- Blackwater & Hawley Town Council
- Boldre Parish Council
- Botley Parish Council
- Braishfield Parish Council
- Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
- Bransgore Parish Council

---

<sup>4</sup> Councillor A. Joy responded twice to the consultation on draft recommendations

- Burley Parish Council
- Bursledon Parish Council
- Compton & Shawford Parish Council
- Copythorne Parish Council
- Durley Parish Council
- Elvetham Heath Parish Council
- Exbury & Lepe Parish Council
- Fair Oak & Horton Heath Parish Council
- Fleet Town Council
- Grayscott Parish Council
- Hound Parish Council
- Hythe & Dibden Parish Council
- Lyminster & Pennington Town Council
- Lyndhurst Parish Council
- Mottisfont Parish Council
- New Milton Town Council
- Otterbourne Parish Council
- Overton Parish Council
- Ringwood Town Council
- Romsey Extra Parish Council
- Rowlands Castle Parish Council
- Tadley Town Council
- Upham Parish Council
- Valley Park Parish Council
- West End Parish Council
- Wield Parish Council
- Winchfield Parish Council
- Yateley Town Council

**Local residents**

- 61 local residents

## Further limited consultation in New Forest and Havant

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/south-east/hampshire/hampshire-county-council>

### **Local authority**

- Hampshire County Council

### **District councils**

- New Forest District Council

### **Local organisations**

- Leigh Park Traders' Association

### **Member of Parliament**

- Alan Mak MP

### **County and district councillors**

- Councillor M. Harris (New Forest District Council)
- Councillor E. Heron (Hampshire County Council and New Forest District Council)
- Councillor K. House (Hampshire County Council)
- Councillor A. Penson (Havant Borough Council)
- Councillor F. Ponsonby (Havant Borough Council)
- Councillor A.W. Rice (Hampshire County Council)

### **Parish councillors**

- Councillor N. Tungate (New Milton Town Council)

### **Political groups**

- Havant Conservative Association
- New Forest East & West Conservative Association
- New Forest West Labour

### **Parish and town councils**

- Beaulieu Parish Council
- Boldre Parish Council
- Bransgore Parish Council
- Burley Parish Council
- Ellingham, Harbridge & Ibsley Parish Council
- Exbury & Lepe Parish Council

- Godshill Parish Council
- Hyde Parish Council
- Lymington & Pennington Town Council
- Netley Marsh Parish Council

**Local residents**

- 55 local residents

# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

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 inequality	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
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
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

