

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Beaconsfield	8
Gerrards Cross and Denham	9
Iver	10
Central Parishes	11
Burnham, Taplow and Dorney	11
Conclusions	13
Parish electoral arrangements	13
3 What happens next?	15
4 Mapping	17
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for South Bucks District Council	18
B Glossary and abbreviations	20



# Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of South Bucks District 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 August 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
3 September 2013	Consultation on council size
26 November 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
4 February 2014	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
29 April 2014	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
22 July 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 28 members, comprising a pattern of two single-member wards, four two-member wards and six three-member wards. Our draft recommendations for South Bucks District Council sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government. All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 30 submissions. These included submissions from the Council, five parish councils, one district councillor, one local organisation and 22 local residents. All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

South Bucks District 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 level and

projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 10.4% to 2019. As stated below, we had some concern as to the likely growth rate in the Taplow area. However, we note that the forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the district, as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics. We are therefore content to use them as the basis of these 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. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations.

Our final recommendations for South Bucks are that the Council should have 28 members, with two single-member wards, four two-member wards and six three-member wards. None of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019.

## What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for South Bucks 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 South Bucks District Council in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our final recommendations for South Bucks District Council 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 the South Bucks 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 the Council during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Bucks District Council* which were published on 29 April 2014. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 22 July 2014.

## What is an electoral review?

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

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

## Why are we conducting a review in South Bucks?

5 We decided to conduct this review because a formal request was made by the Council for an electoral review of South Bucks.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the 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  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for South Bucks.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for South Bucks District Council 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<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

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

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

11 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. In all our reviews 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. 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 South Bucks District Council or the external boundaries or names of parish or 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.

### Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited South Bucks District Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

---

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

14 We received 10 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including a district-wide scheme from the Council. During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 30 submissions. All of the submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

15 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have been assisted by officers at the Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review.

## 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 level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 10.4% to 2019. As stated below, we had some concern as to the likely growth rate in the Taplow area. However, we note that the forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the district, as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics. We are therefore content to use them as the basis of these final recommendations.

## Council size

17 South Bucks District Council currently has 40 councillors elected from 19 district wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal for a council size of 28, a reduction of 12. In support of its proposal, the Council argued that councillor workload on governance issues was low – the Council could operate meeting only four times a year for between one and two hours. It argued that the current governance workload was such that the Council could comfortably continue to perform its governance functions with a council size of 28.

18 Having analysed the evidence received, we considered that the Council had made a robust case for a council size of 28 based on the relatively low workload of members, particularly with regard to the governance functions of the Council.

19 We were therefore of the view that the evidence supported the Council's case that the number of councillors be reduced to 28. We determined to consult publicly on this council size. This consultation ended on 14 October 2013.

20 During this consultation the Commission received nine submissions. Of these, two were from parish councils and seven from members of the public. Three of the nine submissions supported a council size of 28, four opposed it, and two made no comments on council size.

21 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. We noted the concern from respondents as to whether the council would be able to carry out its functions with a council size of 28. However, we considered that these concerns had been adequately addressed in the initial submission made by the Council.

22 We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 28 elected members as the basis of this electoral review and as part of our final recommendations. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 26 November 2013 and ended on 3 February 2014.

## Electoral fairness

23 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.

24 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 (52,800 in 2013 and 58,305 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 28 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 1,886 in 2013 and 2,082 by 2019.

25 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for South Bucks.

## General analysis

26 During the consultation on warding patterns, we received 10 submissions, including a district-wide scheme from the Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the district.

27 We received 30 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included submissions from the Council, five parish councils, one district councillor, one local organisation and 22 local residents. The majority of submissions received were in relation to our recommendations for the Taplow area.

28 In Taplow, we received submissions objecting to our proposed three-member Burnham Lent Rise & Taplow ward and, by association, our proposed three-member Burnham Church & Beeches ward. The District Council proposed an alternative in this area comprising a single-member Taplow ward, a two-member Burnham Beeches ward, and a three-member Burnham Church, Lent Rise & Dorney ward. The submissions received from residents mainly referred to the area's facilities and made frequent reference to residents' strong sense of community identity.

29 In Iver Village & Richings Park, we received two submissions objecting to the inclusion of The Orchards in the proposed Iver Village & Richings Park ward, along with an amended scheme from the Council.

30 Having considered the submissions received, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations in South Bucks. In particular, we remain concerned that the scale and timing of development in the Taplow area is unclear. The growth in electorate primarily relates to a development on Mill Lane and we note that planning permission has not yet been granted for this site. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. We consider that our recommendations for Iver Village & Richings Park ward most accurately reflect communication and transport links in this area.

31 Our final recommendations would result in 28 councillors representing two single-member wards, four two-member wards and six three-member wards. None of our proposed 12 wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for South Bucks by 2019. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in South Bucks.

## Electoral arrangements

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

- Beaconsfield (pages 8–9)
- Gerrards Cross and Denham (pages 9–10)
- Iver (page 10)
- Central parishes (page 11)
- Burnham, Taplow and Dorney (page 11–12)

33 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 18–19 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### Beaconsfield

34 Beaconsfield is a market town and civil parish located in the north-west of South Bucks district.

35 Under our draft recommendations we proposed a single-member Beaconsfield North ward, and the two-member wards of Beaconsfield South and Beaconsfield West. These wards were forecast to have 7% more, 3% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

36 In our draft recommendations, we proposed to move the boundary between Beaconsfield South and Beaconsfield West to run between The Spinney and Old Town Close, instead of down the centre of Old Lodge Drive. This ensured that all properties on The Spinney were included in the same ward. We also proposed that the same boundary follow the county division boundary to the south-west where it meets the A40. This ensured viable parish wards in Beaconsfield. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we did not receive any submissions with regard to our proposed Beaconsfield wards.

37 We have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. We consider that our warding arrangements for Beaconsfield provide a good reflection of community links and follow clearly identifiable ward boundaries.

38 Our final recommendations for Beaconsfield are therefore for the single-member Beaconsfield North ward, and the two-member wards of Beaconsfield South and Beaconsfield West. These wards are forecast to have 7% more, 3% fewer and 5% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. These proposals can be seen on the large map accompanying this report.

## Gerrards Cross and Denham

39 The town of Gerrards Cross and large village of Denham are parishes located in the north-east of South Bucks district.

40 Under the draft recommendations we proposed two three-member wards named Gerrards Cross and Denham which would have 9% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

41 We considered that our proposals for Gerrards Cross and Denham provided for coherent wards which reflected the community identities in this area. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received one submission with regard to our proposed Gerrards Cross and Denham wards. This submission, from Denham Parish Council, was related to their concern over the area's representation. However, it agreed with our draft recommendations in principle and did not provide an alternative warding pattern. We also received a submission from a local resident requesting that Denham be moved into the London Borough of Hillingdon. We are unable to alter the district boundary.

42 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. We consider that the proposed wards present a good balance between our statutory criteria.

43 Under our final recommendations, the three-member wards of Denham and Gerrards Cross are forecast to have 9% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. These proposals are illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Iver

44 The parish of Iver is located in the south-east of South Bucks district, and comprises the settlements of Iver Village, Iver Heath and Richings Park.

45 As part of our draft recommendations for this area, we proposed a two-member Iver Heath ward and a three-member Iver Village & Richings Park ward which would have 4% more and 10% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively.

46 During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received three submissions, one of which was from South Bucks District Council and two of which were from local residents, all of which objected to the placement of the mobile home park on Pickford Drive in the proposed Iver Village & Richings Park ward. We also received a submission from Iver Parish Council, which agreed with our draft recommendations but also suggested minor alterations.

47 The submission received from the Council presented its original warding arrangements in the area, reiterating that retaining the mobile home park in Wexham ward would better reflect the community identity of residents.

48 The submissions received from residents stated that our draft recommendations would be of 'no benefit' to the residents of the mobile home park, who may feel unwelcome in their new ward. They also noted that the park has footpath access into the Wexham area.

49 After carefully considering the submissions received, we consider that our draft recommendations provide the best balance between our statutory criteria. In particular, the main road access from the mobile home park is with areas to its east in our proposed Iver Village & Richings Park ward rather than with Wexham ward to the west. Furthermore, on a visit to the area we confirmed this to be the case. We have concluded that there is insufficient evidence to amend our draft recommendations for this area and therefore confirm them as final.

50 Our final recommendations for Iver are for a two-member Iver Heath ward and a three-member Iver Village & Richings Park ward. These wards are forecast to have 4% more and 10% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. These proposals are illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Central parishes

51 As part of our draft recommendations for the centre of the district, we proposed a single-member Wexham & Fulmer ward and a two-member Stoke Poges ward, along with a three-member Farnham & Hedgerley ward which was based on the Council's submission. These wards would have 4% fewer, 7% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor when compared with the district average by 2019 respectively.

52 During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received four submissions that made reference to these areas – two from residents, one from Wexham Parish Council and one from Hedgerley Parish Council.

53 One submission from a local resident stated that Wexham Park Hospital should be within the Wexham & Fulmer ward. However, as the hospital falls outside the South Bucks district boundary, it is not possible to accommodate this proposal.

54 Two of the submissions, from Wexham Parish Council and a local resident, objected to our proposed Wexham & Fulmer ward. Wexham Parish Council proposed that joining Wexham with Fulmer would be to the detriment of Wexham. The local resident considered our proposed ward to be too large for one councillor to represent effectively. Hedgerley Parish Council objected to our proposed Farnham & Hedgerley ward, on the basis that it would result in more than one district councillor for Hedgerley and therefore a loss of 'focused local administration'.

55 After carefully considering the submissions received, we consider that our draft recommendations provide the best balance between our statutory criteria. We were not persuaded that the evidence received justified the reversion to a different warding pattern, nor did the alternatives submitted provide the best balance between our statutory criteria.

56 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations in this area as final. We consider that our warding arrangements for these central parts of the district best reflect our statutory criteria.

57 Our final recommendations for the central parishes in South Bucks are for the single-member Wexham & Fulmer ward, the two-member Stoke Poges ward, and the three-member Farnham & Hedgerley ward. These wards are forecast to have 4% fewer, 7% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019 respectively. These proposals are illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Burnham, Taplow and Dorney

58 Our draft recommendations for the south-west of the district were for the three-member wards of Burnham Church & Beeches and Burnham Lent Rise & Taplow. During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 21

submissions from residents, one from a local group, and comments from South Bucks District Council relating to our proposals for this area.

59 The submission from the Council put forward three wards in this area. These were a two-member Burnham Beeches ward, a three-member Burnham Church, Lent Rise & Dorney ward, and a single-member Taplow ward. The Council proposed that the single-member Taplow ward will accommodate the area's growth due to development over the coming years.

60 When formulating our recommendations, we carefully examined the Council's proposed Taplow ward. Due to developments, the electoral variance in this ward is forecast to improve from 25% fewer electors per councillor to 3% fewer in 2019. We note that this growth in electorate primarily relates to a development on Mill Lane. Although discussion and development of plans for this site are ongoing, we note that planning permission has not yet been granted. Due to our continued concern over this development, we have sought to develop recommendations in this area which would provide good levels of electoral equality in both now and in 2019, regardless of the likely phasing of the development.

61 The submissions from residents all focused on Taplow and objected to the inclusion of Taplow in a ward with Burnham Lent Rise and Dorney. The submissions focused mainly on the strong sense of community identity within Taplow and the facilities available within the village. We have carefully considered the submission received but remain unpersuaded that we have received sufficient evidence to modify our draft recommendations. We consider that our recommendations will ensure good electoral equality, use identifiable ward boundaries and would not arbitrarily divide communities in the Taplow area.

62 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations in this area as final. Our final recommendations for this area are for the three member Burnham Church & Beeches ward and the three-member Burnham Lent Rise & Taplow ward. These wards are forecast to have 1% more and 5% more electors per councillor respectively than the district average by 2019. These proposals are illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Conclusions

63 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2019 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2019
Number of councillors	28	28
Number of electoral wards	12	12
Average number of electors per councillor	1,886	2,082
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

### **Final recommendation**

South Bucks District Council should comprise 28 councillors serving 12 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

## Parish electoral arrangements

64 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.

65 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, the 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.

66 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 Beaconsfield, Burnham, Iver and Wexham parishes.

67 As a result of our proposed electoral 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 Beaconsfield parish.

**Final recommendation**

Beaconsfield Town Council should return 16 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Central (returning four members), North (returning three members), South East (returning two members) and West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

68 As a result of our proposed electoral 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 Burnham parish.

**Final recommendation**

Burnham Parish Council should return 19 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Beeches (returning eight members), Church (returning four members) and Lent Rise (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

69 As a result of our proposed electoral 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 Iver parish.

**Final recommendation**

Iver Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Iver Heath (returning six members), Iver Village & Richings Park (returning six members), Shreding Green (returning one member) and Wood Lane (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

70 As a result of our proposed electoral 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 Wexham parish.

**Final recommendation**

Wexham Parish Council should return nine parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: George Green & Middle Green (returning five members), The Orchards (returning two members) and Wexham Street (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

71 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for South Bucks 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 South Bucks District Council in 2015.

#### Equalities

72 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.



## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for South Bucks

73 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for South Bucks District Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for South Bucks District Council.

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

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final recommendations for South Bucks District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Beaconsfield North	1	2,095	2,095	11%	2,232	2,232	7%
2	Beaconsfield South	2	3,158	1,579	-16%	4,019	2,010	-3%
3	Beaconsfield West	2	3,855	1,928	2%	4,357	2,179	5%
4	Burnham Church & Beeches	3	5,747	1,916	2%	6,327	2,109	1%
5	Burnham Lent Rise & Taplow	3	5,639	1,880	0%	6,544	2,181	5%
6	Denham	3	5,982	1,994	6%	6,800	2,267	9%
7	Farnham & Hedgerley	3	5,341	1,780	-6%	5,871	1,957	-6%
8	Gerrards Cross	3	6,140	2,047	9%	6,306	2,102	1%
9	Iver Village & Richings Park	3	4,929	1,643	-13%	5,653	1,884	-10%
10	Iver Heath	2	4,156	2,078	10%	4,325	2,163	4%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for South Bucks District Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2019)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
11	Stoke Poges	2	3,823	1,912	1%	3,874	1,937	-7%
12	Wexham & Fulmer	1	1,935	1,935	3%	1,997	1,997	-4%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>52,800</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>58,305</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,886</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,082</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the South Bucks 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 or division, expressed in parishes or existing wards or divisions, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral imbalance	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections

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

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

