

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Newark	9
Collingham, Farndon and the east area	10
Sutton-on-Trent and the Trentside villages	10
Southwell	11
Rainworth, Ollerton and the west area	12
Conclusions	15
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	18
4 Mapping	20
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Newark & Sherwood Council	21
B Glossary and abbreviations	23

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Newark & Sherwood District Council ('the Council') to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in May 2012.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
26 February 2013	Consultation on council size begins
28 May 2013	Submission of proposals for ward patterns to the LGBCE
6 August 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 October 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
7 January 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 39 members comprising a pattern of eight single-member, five two-member and seven three-member wards. The recommendations were broadly based on those of Newark & Sherwood District Council with several modifications to improve the electoral equality where necessary and to provide for more easily identifiable boundaries. Our draft recommendations for Newark & Sherwood District Council sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

Submissions received

In response to consultation on our draft recommendations for Newark & Sherwood we received 93 submissions, including one from the District Council, 11 from district councillors, 27 from parish councils, including two submissions from Rainworth Parish Council, five from political groups, two from Members of Parliament, three from local organisations, 43 from local residents, and a petition. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

As part of this review, Newark & Sherwood District Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a date five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of 9.2% over this period.

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

General analysis

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

Our final recommendations for Newark & Sherwood are for a mixed pattern of nine single-member, six two-member and six three-member wards. We consider our recommendations provide for good electoral equality while providing an accurate reflection of community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Newark & Sherwood District Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Newark & Sherwood District Council, in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

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

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Newark & Sherwood District Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submissions received from Newark & Sherwood District Council during the initial stages of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Newark & Sherwood District Council*, which were published on 15 October 2013. We then undertook a period of consultation which ended on 6 January 2014.

What is an electoral review?

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

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in Newark & Sherwood?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on the December 2012 electorate figures, 36% of wards in the district currently have variances of +/-10%. One ward, Farndon, has an electoral variance of 18%.

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Newark & Sherwood District Council.

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

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
 - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

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

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

12 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Newark & Sherwood District Council or the external boundaries or names of parish and town councils, or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that our recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. Our proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

13 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (‘the 2009 Act’). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

14 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct

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

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

Submissions received

15 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Newark & Sherwood District Council and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 34 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including a district-wide scheme from the Council. We received 93 submissions during the consultation period on our draft recommendations. All submissions may be inspected both at our offices and those of the council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

16 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of 9.2% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account a number of housing developments planned for the town over the next six years.

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

Council size

18 Newark & Sherwood District Council currently has 46 councillors elected from 25 wards, comprising eight single-member, 13 two-member and four three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed a council size of 38, a reduction of eight members. The submission from the Council had considered its governance and management structure, scrutiny of the council, work on outside bodies, members' representational role and the Council's other statutory functions. Having considered the evidence received we decided to consult on a council size of 38.

19 We received 11 submissions during the consultation on council size. These were from five parish councils and six local residents. The Council did not submit a second representation. The representations from local residents proposed council sizes ranging from 37 to 46.

20 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. Although the submissions received provided mixed support for a council size of 38, we did not receive strong evidence for any other council size, nor was any evidence submitted to contradict the rationale presented by the Council. We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 38 as the basis of this electoral review and invited

proposals for warding arrangements based on this number of councillors.

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

22 The Council's proposed warding pattern was for 39 members, and provided for a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards. We investigated whether a warding pattern based on 39 members rather than 38 better met our criteria. We considered that a warding pattern based on 39 members resulted in a better allocation of councillors east and west of the River Trent and would provide for a scheme which would better meet our statutory criteria. Therefore, our draft recommendations for Newark & Sherwood District Council were based on a council size of 39.

23 In proposing a council size of 39 as part of our draft recommendations we were of the view that such a size would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors' representational role. We have not received any evidence during consultation on our draft recommendations to suggest otherwise. We have therefore confirmed a council size of 39 members for Newark and Sherwood District Council as final.

Electoral fairness

24 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

25 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (86,382 in 2013 and 94,358 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 39 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 2,215 in 2013 and 2,419 by 2019.

26 Under our draft recommendations, one of our proposed wards will have an electoral variance of more than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. The outlier is Edwinstowe & Clipstone, which will have a variance of 11%. We are satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Newark & Sherwood.

General analysis

27 Prior to formulating our draft recommendations we received 34 submissions on warding arrangements for Newark & Sherwood, including a district-wide proposal from the Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district.

28 The scheme submitted by the Council provided a mixed warding arrangement of single-, two- and three-member wards. Our draft recommendations sought to reflect the evidence of community identity received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

29 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that while the Council's proposed pattern of wards generally used clearly identifiable boundaries, they did not result in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the district. The Council proposed one ward with a variance greater than 30% and its proposals would have resulted in 29% of wards having a variance of greater than +/- 10%. We therefore made a large number of modifications to the Council's proposals in order to improve electoral equality and to reflect community identities.

30 We proposed a council size of 39, based on a pattern of eight single-member, five two-member and seven three-member wards.

31 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 93 submissions – one from the District Council, and 11 district councillors, 27 parish councils, including two submissions from Rainworth Parish Council, five political groups, two Members of Parliament, three local organisations, 43 local residents and a petition.

32 The Council was supportive of many of our draft recommendations but proposed a number of modifications to the pattern of wards for the west of Newark town, the Rainworth area and Collingham. The Council also proposed changes to the ward boundaries for Southwell town and suggested alternative warding arrangements for Farndon & Fernwood.

33 The other submissions we received during consultation on our draft recommendations largely focussed on specific areas. The majority of submissions received focussed on the Rainworth area, Muskham and Newark.

34 Our final recommendations would result in nine single-member wards, six two-member wards and six three-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in Newark & Sherwood.

35 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 21–22) and on the large map accompanying this report.

Electoral arrangements

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

- Newark (pages 9–10)
- Collingham, Farndon and the east area (page 10)
- Sutton-on-Trent and the Trentside villages (pages 10–11)
- Southwell (pages 11–12)
- Rainworth, Ollerton and the west area (pages 12–15)

37 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 21–22 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Newark

38 Our draft recommendations for Newark were for a mixed pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards. These wards were based on those proposed by the Council, subject to a number of modifications. The modifications sought to improve electoral equality, provide for wards with complete internal communication links and better reflect local communities.

39 We received seven submissions commenting on our proposed Newark wards. Both Councillor Payne and Councillor Buckley (the current councillors for Castle ward) expressed concern at our proposal to reduce Castle to a single-member ward. The councillors stated that they considered the streets between Hawton Road and the River Devon, which we had included in Devon ward, to be part of the Castle area. We investigated whether it would be possible to include these streets in our Castle ward. Our investigations indicated that this modification would result in a two-member Castle ward having 30% fewer electors than the district average by 2019. We consider this to be an unacceptable level of electoral inequality.

40 The Council also proposed increasing Castle from a single-member to a two-member ward. The area it proposed including in Castle ward was larger than that proposed by Councillors Payne and Buckley. The Council suggested that the boundary of Castle ward extend east to Sherwood Avenue. This was also proposed by Newark Town Council. While this would result in a reasonable level of electoral equality, with 7% fewer electors than the district average by 2019, we did not consider that the boundaries were easily identifiable or clearly reflected community identities. We considered that the Council's proposed boundaries, including streets as far west as Balderton Gate in Castle ward with the streets around Farndon Road to the west of the river, appeared to arbitrarily divide the community. We have therefore decided not to modify our draft recommendations for Castle ward.

41 The Council also proposed changes to the boundaries of Devon, Bridge and Beacon wards in Newark. These changes were proposed as a consequence of the change to Castle ward. As we are not adopting the Council's proposed changes to Castle, we are also not adopting the changes to ward boundaries in the rest of the town.

42 We received no other submissions regarding Newark town. We have therefore decided to confirm our proposed wards of Beacon, Bridge, Castle and Devon as final. Our proposed wards would have 5% fewer, 2% fewer, 1% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Balderton

43 Our draft recommendations for this area were for two two-member wards, as at present, though with substantially different boundaries to the current wards.

44 We received three submissions commenting on the Balderton area. Barnby-in-the-Willows Parish Council did not object to the parish being included in Balderton North ward, although it expressed concern at being part of a two-member ward. Coddington Parish Council suggested an alternative warding pattern for the area. It

suggested that Coddington parish be included in our Beacon ward in Newark town. A local resident also opposed the proposed ward and suggested a ward for Winthorpe, Coddington, Holme, Langford, Brough and Barnby-in-the-Willows.

45 The Council supported our draft recommendations for Balderton. While we have considered the alternative suggestions made we consider that persuasive evidence has not been received to modify our draft recommendations in this part of the district.

46 We have decided to confirm our proposed wards of Balderton North & Coddington and Balderton South as final. The two-member wards are forecast to have 7% more and 4% more to the district average of electors by 2019.

Collingham, Farndon and the east area

47 Our draft recommendations for Collingham were for a two-member ward, combining the single-member Trent East and Collingham wards proposed by the Council. This ward would have 7% fewer electors than the district average by 2019.

48 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received three submissions regarding Collingham. The Council reiterated its proposal for two single-member wards. While its previous proposal included all of the village of Collingham in a single ward, the Council's new proposal divided the village between two wards, using the High Street and Besthorpe Road as the boundary.

49 We consider that such a boundary would divide the community in Collingham and not represent the best balance between the statutory criteria. We are therefore confirming our proposed two-member Collingham ward as final.

50 The Council proposed an alternative warding pattern for Farndon & Fernwood. It suggested a single-member ward for Farndon, East Stoke and Thorpe and a two-member ward for Fernwood and the villages to its south, including Elston and Syerston. The Council acknowledged that such a ward would have a high level of electoral inequality, with 13% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Nor would it have complete internal communication links as it would be necessary to travel outside the boundaries of Fernwood ward to reach the villages of Elston and Syerston.

51 We received five other submissions regarding this area. All opposed our draft recommendations and proposed the area be divided between a two-member Fernwood ward and a single-member Farndon ward. We investigated whether this would be possible. However, as the only road from the parishes of Alverton, Kilvington, Staunton and Cotham runs through Hawton, it would not be possible to divide the wards while maintaining internal communication links. Therefore, we have decided to confirm our proposed Farndon & Fernwood ward as final. The ward would have 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

Sutton-on-Trent and the Trentside villages

Sutton-on-Trent

52 Our draft recommendations for Sutton-on-Trent were for a single-member ward including the parishes of Sutton-on-Trent, Grassthorpe, Carlton-on-Trent, Eganton, Ompton, Weston, Laxton & Moorhouse, Ossington, Kneesall, Kersall, and Maplebeck.

53 The Council supported our proposal for Sutton-on-Trent. The majority of other submissions received also supported this warding pattern. Weston Parish Council supported its inclusion in the ward. Two respondents proposed extending the ward to include the neighbouring village of Wellow. We have not adopted this change as several residents in Wellow provided evidence that the parish looks south and west to Eakring and Rufford (see paragraph 69).

54 Carlton-on-Trent Parish Council welcomed being included in our Sutton-on-Trent ward, but expressed concern that our proposed ward was too large. This was supported by a district councillor, Councillor Rose, who suggested that in order to reduce the size of the proposed ward the parishes of Kneesall, Ompton and Kersall be included in Muskham ward. We are not adopting this proposal as we received a large number of submissions supporting our draft recommendations for Muskham (see paragraph 57).

55 We are therefore confirming our proposed Sutton-on-Trent ward as final. The ward would have 8% more electors than the district average by 2019.

Muskham and Trent

56 Our single-member Muskham ward contains the parishes of North Muskham, South Muskham, Bathley, Caunton, Cromwell and Norwell.

57 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received a large number of submissions regarding the Muskham area. All except one of these submissions supported our draft recommendations for Muskham. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for Muskham as final. The Muskham ward will have 6% fewer electors than the district average by 2019.

58 Our proposed Trentside ward contained the parishes of Averham, Bleasby, Kelham, Fiskerton cum Morton, Rolleston, Staythorpe and Upton. We received two submissions concerning the Trentside area during consultation on our draft recommendations. The submissions largely supported our proposed ward, but suggested it be named Trent. This name change was also proposed by the Council. As the ward is similar to the current ward of that name, we are adopting this ward name as part of our final recommendations.

59 With the exception of the name change we are confirming our draft recommendations as final. Our Trent ward will have 1% fewer electors than the district average by 2019.

Southwell

60 Our draft recommendations for Southwell were for a three-member ward based on the town and the parishes of Edingley, Halam, Halloughton, Hockerton, Kirklington and Winkburn.

61 During consultation on our draft recommendations we received several representations proposing three single-member wards for the town and the surrounding villages. The Council proposed a Southwell South ward including Halloughton, a Southwell West ward including Halam and Edingley, and a Southwell North ward including Hockerton, Kirklington and Winkburn. The same boundaries

were proposed by Patrick Mercer MP.

62 The current councillor for Southwell East, Councillor Hamilton, also proposed three single-member wards for Southwell. His proposed pattern of wards was similar to those proposed by the Council but also included the parish of Upton and excluded the parish of Edingley. Councillor Hamilton did not provide details of where the boundaries would be within Southwell town. We are therefore unable to adopt his proposals.

63 We investigated the three single-member wards as proposed by the Council. We considered that the boundaries proposed were not easily identifiable. The boundaries of the proposed Southwell North ward, in particular, seemed arbitrary and not reflective of the communities in this area. Our investigations also indicated that three single-member wards would not result in reasonable levels of electoral equality. While the Council stated the three North, South and West wards would have 8% fewer, 9% fewer and 4% fewer electors than the district average by 2019, we calculated that the wards would have 3% fewer, 14% fewer and 5% fewer.

64 We are therefore not adopting single-member wards for Southwell and are confirming our draft recommendation as final. Our three-member Southwell ward will have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

Rainworth, Ollerton and the west area

Rainworth

65 Our draft recommendations for Rainworth were for a three-member Rainworth North & Bilsthorpe ward and a two-member Rainworth South & Blidworth ward. These wards would have 2% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

66 We received a large number of submissions regarding Rainworth, including a 186-signature petition. The majority of submissions did not support the proposed warding pattern for this area. Several respondents, including those who signed the petition, proposed a two-member ward covering just the parish of Rainworth. While this would provide a good level of electoral equality for Rainworth, it would require significant modifications to our proposed wards in the rest of the west of the district.

67 The submissions received considered that Rainworth had few links to the Bilsthorpe area. It was also noted that part of Rainworth is within the Mansfield District and so the town will be divided between three district wards. We noted that it was not ideal to split the town between wards, but this was necessary in order to achieve reasonable levels of electoral equality in this part of the district.

68 The District Council opposed our draft recommendations in this part of the district and proposed an alternative warding pattern. This was based on a single-member Bilsthorpe ward and a Rainworth & Rufford ward, which included the parishes of Wellow and Eakring.

69 We received submissions from Wellow Parish Council and seven Wellow residents, stating that the parish looked towards the parishes of Eakring and Rufford, rather than Ollerton. This was supported by Eakring Parish Council, which stated that Eakring would be better served by being included in a ward with Rufford and Wellow

as the parishes have a shared rural character. Rufford Parish Council proposed the same warding pattern.

70 We investigated creating a ward for Wellow, Eakring and Rufford. Such a ward would not have a good level of electoral equality, with 53% fewer electors than the district average by 2019. However, it is possible to keep the parishes together and achieve a good level of equality by including the three parishes with an area of Rainworth, as proposed by the Council and by Wellow Parish Council. We are therefore modifying our proposed Rainworth North & Bilsthorpe ward. Our two-member Rainworth & Rufford ward includes part of Rainworth town and the parishes of Rufford, Eakring and Wellow. The ward will now cover the parish of Wellow and will not include Bilsthorpe parish.

71 Consequently, we are also adopting the Council's proposed single-member Bilsthorpe ward as part of our final recommendations. A single-member ward for Bilsthorpe was also supported by Bilsthorpe Parish Council. We are also including the area between Mickledale Lane and Leighton Park in our Bilsthorpe ward. While these streets are part of Rufford parish, we consider that they have more connection to the community of Bilsthorpe.

72 The Council supported our proposal to include Blidworth with the southern part of Rainworth, though it proposed using the polling district boundary as the division between the two wards. The polling district runs along the backs of houses on the west side of South Avenue. We consider our proposed boundary, of Warsop Lane and Southwell Road East, to be clearer and more identifiable. We have therefore decided not to modify this boundary.

73 The proposal to join Rainworth South with Blidworth was supported by Blidworth Parish Council. The Parish Council noted that it was necessary for Blidworth to be joined with part of Rainworth in order to achieve a good level of electoral equality for the area. We are therefore confirming our proposed Rainworth South & Blidworth ward as final.

74 Our single-member Bilsthorpe and two-member Rainworth North & Rufford and Rainworth South & Blidworth wards would have 2% more, 5% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

Edwinstowe and Clipstone

75 In the north-west of the district we proposed a three-member Edwinstowe & Clipstone ward. The Council stated that three single-member wards would better reflect the local communities. This was supported by a local resident, who stated that Edwinstowe is a tourist area and has very different needs from neighbouring Clipstone. However, the single-member wards as suggested by the Council during our initial consultation on warding patterns had very high levels of electoral inequality, including an Edwinstowe North ward that would have 21% more electors than the district average by 2019. We consider this to be an unacceptable level of electoral inequality.

76 We received no other representations regarding this area. We are therefore confirming our draft three-member Edwinstowe & Clipstone ward as final. The ward would have 11% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

We consider this level of electoral inequality is justified given the ward's position on the western edge of the district and the benefit of not splitting the community of Edwinstowe.

Ollerton and Boughton

77 Ollerton and Boughton are a neighbouring town and village to the north of the district that together make up one parish. Our draft recommendations were for a three-member Ollerton ward and a single-member Boughton ward. These wards would have 2% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

78 Our draft recommendations for this area included the parish of Wellow in Ollerton ward. As a result of submissions received we have decided to include Wellow in our Rainworth North & Rufford ward (see paragraphs 69–70).

79 Ollerton & Boughton Town Council opposed our draft recommendations as they created two parish wards for the town, rather than the current three. The Council proposed the parish retain three parish wards despite being divided between only two district wards. They requested that Ollerton parish be divided into parish wards of Ollerton North ward, Ollerton South ward and Boughton. We have decided to adopt this modification to the parish electoral arrangements for Ollerton & Boughton. These are detailed in the parish electoral arrangements section of the report at paragraph 93.

80 With the exception of the modification to include Wellow in our Rainworth & Rufford ward, we are confirming our draft recommendations in this area as final. Our three-member Ollerton ward and single-member Boughton ward would have 3% fewer and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Farnsfield

81 Our draft recommendations for Farnsfield were for a single-member ward coterminous with the parish boundaries. The Council supported our proposed ward, as did Sherwood Conservative Association and Mark Spencer MP.

82 Edingley Parish Council and a local resident proposed including the parish of Edingley in our Farnsfield ward. We investigated this modification and found that it would increase the level of electoral inequality in the area as it would result in a Farnsfield & Edingley ward with 14% more electors than the district average by 2019.

83 We did not consider that the community evidence received was persuasive enough to justify this level of electoral inequality. We consider the ward as proposed in our draft recommendations provides a good balance between the statutory criteria. We are therefore confirming our single-member Farnsfield ward as final. The ward would have equal to the district average of electors by 2019.

Dover Beck and Lowdham

84 The parishes of Oxtun, Epperstone and Gonalston together make up the area known as Dover Beck. Our proposed Dover Beck ward was based on that proposed by the Council, with the exception of the parish of Halloughton, which we included in our Southwell ward.

85 The Council supported our proposed ward, as did Sherwood Conservative Association and Councillor Blaney. We received no other submissions regarding this area. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendation as final. The single-member Dover Beck ward would have 2% more electors than the district average by 2019.

86 South of Dover Beck are the parishes of Lowdham and Bulcote. We proposed a single-member Lowdham ward for this area. We received no submission regarding the proposed ward. We are therefore confirming this ward as final. The single-member Lowdham ward would have 6% fewer electors than the district average by 2019.

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	39	39
Number of electoral wards	21	21
Average number of electors per councillor	2,215	2,419
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	5	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendation
 Newark & Sherwood District Council should comprise 39 councillors serving 21 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

88 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

89 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral

arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Newark & Sherwood District Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

90 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Balderton, Coddington, Ollerton & Boughton, Newark, Rainworth and Rufford.

91 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Balderton parish.

Final recommendation

Balderton Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Balderton North (returning eight members) and Balderton South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

92 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Coddington parish.

Final recommendation

Coddington Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Coddington East (returning nine members) and Coddington West (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

93 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Ollerton & Boughton parish.

Final recommendation

Ollerton & Boughton Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Ollerton North (returning eight members), Ollerton South (returning five members) and Boughton (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

94 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Newark parish.

Final recommendation

Newark Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Beacon (returning six members), Bridge (returning four members), Castle (returning two members) and Devon (returning six members). The proposed parish

ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

95 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Rainworth parish.

Final recommendation

Rainworth Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Rainworth North (returning nine members) and Rainworth South (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

96 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Rufford parish.

Final recommendation

Rufford Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Forest (returning six members) and Mickledale (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

97 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Newark & Sherwood District Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Newark & Sherwood District Council in 2015.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Newark & Sherwood

98 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Newark & Sherwood District Council:

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

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Newark & Sherwood District Council

	Ward Name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Balderton North & Coddington	2	4,685	2,343	6%	5,179	2,589	7%
2	Balderton South	2	4,500	2,250	2%	5,043	2,522	4%
3	Beacon	3	5,454	1,818	-18%	6,914	2,305	-5%
4	Bilsthorpe	1	2,515	2,515	14%	2,468	2,468	2%
5	Boughton	1	2,377	2,377	7%	2,439	2,439	1%
6	Bridge	2	4,282	2,141	-3%	4,742	2,371	-2%
7	Castle	1	2,404	2,404	9%	2,450	2,450	1%
8	Collingham	2	4,361	2,181	-2%	4,484	2,242	-7%
9	Devon	3	7,088	2,363	7%	7,179	2,393	-1%
10	Dover Beck	1	2,380	2,380	7%	2,458	2,458	2%
11	Edwinstowe & Clipstone	3	7,691	2,564	16%	8,080	2,693	11%
12	Farndon & Fernwood	3	4,595	1,532	-31%	7,630	2,543	5%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Newark & Sherwood District Council

Ward Name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Farnsfield	1	2,185	2,185	-1%	2,414	2,414	0%
14 Lowdham	1	2,289	2,289	3%	2,266	2,266	-6%
15 Muskham	1	2,401	2,401	8%	2,270	2,270	-6%
16 Ollerton	3	6,706	2,235	1%	7,027	2,342	-3%
17 Rainworth North & Rufford	2	4,767	2,384	8%	5,061	2,530	5%
18 Rainworth South & Blidworth	2	4,134	2,067	-7%	4,520	2,260	-7%
19 Southwell	3	6,762	2,254	2%	6,736	2,245	-7%
20 Sutton-on-Trent	1	2,461	2,461	11%	2,604	2,604	8%
21 Trent	1	2,345	2,345	6%	2,394	2,394	-1%
Totals	39	86,382	-	-	94,358	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,215	-	-	2,419	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Newark & Sherwood District Council.

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

Appendix B

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward

Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average

Ward

A specific area of a district or district, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or district council