

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	8
Grantham	9
Rural South Kesteven	10
Bourne	12
Stamford	12
Market Deeping and Deeping St James	12
Conclusions	13
Parish electoral arrangements	13
3 What happens next?	15
4 Mapping	17
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final Recommendations for South Kesteven District Council	18
B Glossary and abbreviations	21

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 Kesteven 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 February 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
26 February 2013	Consultation on council size
28 May 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to 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 56 members, comprising eight single-member wards, 18 two-member wards and four three-member wards. The recommendations were broadly based on those of the Council, subject to modifications to reflect our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations for South Kesteven 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

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 23 submissions including comments covering the majority of the district. Six submissions were received from district and county councillors and one from the District Council as a whole. 10 submissions were from parish and town councils, one from Grantham Labour Party and five from members of the public. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

As part of this review, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 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 projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 7.5% over this period. This growth was largely due to developments in Grantham, Bourne, Stamford and Market Deeping. We are content that the 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. We have considered all submissions received whilst formulating our final recommendations. As a result, we have proposed two ward name changes.

Our final recommendations for South Kesteven are that the Council should have 56 members, with eight single-member wards, 18 two-member wards and four 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 Kesteven 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 Kesteven 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

You can also view our final recommendations for South Kesteven District Council on our interactive maps at <https://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 South Kesteven's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to South Kesteven as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Kesteven District Council*, which were published on 15 October 2013. We then undertook a further 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 South Kesteven?

5 We decided to conduct this review because, based on October 2012 electorate data provided by the Council, 38% of the district's wards currently have a variance of more than 10%. Of these, both Grantham St John's and Ringstone wards have electoral variances of 26%.

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 for the electoral arrangements for South Kesteven.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for South Kesteven is to achieve a level of electoral equality – 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 2009² 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 equality 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 equality over a five-year period.

12 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.

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

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

Submissions received

14 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited South Kesteven District Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received seven submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including a district-wide scheme from the Council. During consultation on our draft recommendations we received 23 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

Electorate figures

15 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 7.5% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council indicated that growth in electorate was largely centred on developments taking place in Grantham, Bourne, Stamford and Market Deeping.

16 When investigating the warding patterns proposed for the Bourne area it came to light that the Council had not included a significant development in its electoral projections. We queried this with the Council who agreed that the electorate figures needed to be updated to reflect this development. The Council then provided revised electorate figures for a specific polling district in Bourne. 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

17 The Council currently has 58 councillors elected from 34 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 55, a reduction of three. In support of its proposal, the Council argued that it sought to retain the current governance arrangements and considered this would be sustainable under a council size of 55. The Council also argued that its existing decision-making structures were representative, inclusive and reflective of the diverse nature of the district. Lastly, the Council considered that a council size of 55 would enable members to be effective in undertaking their representational role.

18 Having considered the submission presented by the Council, we were of the view that the evidence supported the case that the number of councillors could be reduced to 55. We determined to consult publicly on this council size. This consultation ended on 8 April 2013.

19 We received nine other submissions during the consultation on council size. These were from Bourne Town Council, Barkston & Syston Parish Council and seven residents.

20 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. The submissions received largely favoured a reduction in council size and many supported a council size of 55. We received two proposals for alternative council sizes of 10 and 50. However, little evidence was provided to support these alternative council sizes.

21 We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 55 elected members as the basis of this electoral review. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 28 May 2013 and ended on 5 August 2013. During the consultation on warding arrangements we received no representations relating to council size.

22 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 provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

23 The Council's proposed warding pattern was for 55 members and provided for a mix of single-, two- and three-member wards. In light of the change to the electorate forecasts detailed below, we investigated whether a council size of 55 provided the best allocation between the main towns and rural area. We considered that a warding pattern based on 56 members resulted in a better allocation of councillors between the main towns and rural area and would provide for a scheme which would better meet our statutory criteria.

24 We are of the view that a council size of 56 members would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors' representational role. Therefore, our final recommendations for South Kesteven District Council are based on a council size of 56.

Electoral fairness

25 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.

26 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 (107,137 in 2012 and 115,167 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 56 in our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,913 in 2012 and 2,057 by 2019.

27 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 Kesteven.

General analysis

28 During the consultation on draft recommendations, we received 23 submissions including comments covering the majority of the district. Six submissions were received from district and county councillors and one from the District Council as a whole. Ten submissions were from parish and town councils, one from Grantham Labour Party and five from members of the public.

29 The submission from the Council commented on a number of areas particularly in and around Grantham. It mainly reiterated points made during the previous consultation stage regarding parish wards but also accepted a number of our recommendations. The submission from the Grantham Labour Party objected to the proposal to create a parish ward in Loundthorpe & Harrowby Without parish and supported the Council's original scheme. The remaining response from parish councils and members of the public mainly concerned the creation of parish wards in a number of areas, the decision to create a two-member Peascliffe & Ridgeway ward and the naming of several wards.

30 Having considered the submissions received, we consider that sufficient evidence has been received to revert from the ward names of Grantham Priory and Fenside to Grantham St Wulfram's and Aveland respectively and to amend the name of Austerby ward to Bourne Austerby. For the remainder of the district we consider that evidence has not been received to justify modifying our draft recommendations.

31 Our final recommendations would result in eight single-member wards, 18 two-member wards and four three-member wards. Under the final recommendations, none of the wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019.

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 Kesteven. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Grantham (pages 9–10)
- Rural South Kesteven (pages 10–12)
- Bourne (page 12)
- Stamford (page 12)
- Market Deeping and Deeping St James (page 12)

33 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 18–20 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Grantham

34 Grantham is the largest town in the district. It is unparished and dissected by two railway lines and the River Witham. Under a council size of 56, Grantham is allocated 15 councillors, one fewer than present.

35 In addition to the Council's response to our draft recommendations we received a small number of submissions relating to Grantham.

36 Our draft recommendations for the north and west of Grantham were for a three-member ward of Grantham St Vincent's and the two-member wards of Grantham Arnoldfield, Grantham Harrowby and Grantham Priors with variances of 4% fewer, 8% more, 6% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Our draft recommendations were based on the Council scheme and a proposal from Councillors Selby and Wells (Grantham Harrowby) for Grantham Harrowby and Grantham St Vincent's wards. However, we recommended modifications to include electors who straddled defaced parish boundaries on the edge of the town in the wards of Grantham. We consider that these modifications better reflected community identities in the area and improved electoral equality.

37 During consultation, we received opposition from the Council and from Great Gonerby Parish Council to our proposal to include a small portion of Great Gonerby parish in our proposed Grantham Arnoldfield ward. We considered this alternative proposal but, as mentioned in our draft recommendations, the ward proposed by the Council did not provide for complete internal transport links. We also observed that the boundary proposed by the Council divided a continuous estate around the Pennine Way area. Therefore, we are still of the view that the Council's proposed ward would not provide for effective and convenient local government or better reflect community identities.

38 We received opposition from the Council to our proposed Grantham Harrowby and Grantham St Vincent's wards. Again, the Council requested that we reconsider their original proposals for the area. This was supported by Grantham Labour Party. The Council argued that our proposed Grantham Harrowby ward does not include Harrowby Church of England Infant School or Harrowby Youth Centre, and separated people in the Harrowby estate from their local amenities on New Beacon Road. They also argued that following the rear of properties on Harrowby Lane did not constitute a clearly identifiable ward boundary.

39 Having visited the area during the course of this review, we consider that the boundary between Grantham Harrowby and Grantham St Vincent's is an appropriate one. This boundary allows for better electoral equality for the area than the Council's proposals which would see two wards of Grantham Harrowby and Grantham St Vincent's with variances of 11% fewer and 10% fewer than the district average by 2019 respectively. We also note that the majority of the Harrowby estate is included in the proposed Grantham Harrowby ward.

40 The Council opposed our inclusion of the areas around Saltersford Road and Hillside Drive (that are in the parish of Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without) in our proposed Grantham St Vincent's ward. We also received opposition from Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without Parish Council in respect of our proposal to create a parish ward in this area. The Council noted that the new proposed

development of Spitalgate Heath would initially have access from Saltersford Road and Bridge End Grove only and that we should not include those areas in Grantham St Vincent's without including the proposed new development. We note that were these two areas to remain in Belmont ward, this ward would not have internal transport access as both areas have access to the main road within Grantham St Vincent's ward. We are aware that development in the area will be underway but not completed by 2019. We have, as required by legislation, taken reasonable account of five-year forecasts for this area and note that it will effectively form an extension of Grantham town. However, we consider that the defacement of the parish boundary means that a continuous area of existing housing would be divided between wards. We consider this would not reflect community identities and linkages in the area.

41 For these reasons we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final. We consider both wards provide for good levels of electoral equality and reflect the community identity.

42 The submissions received for the Grantham Priory ward reflected opposition to the proposed ward name and also, again, opposition to the creation of a parish ward within Belton & Manthorpe parish. The Council accepted the submissions opposing its original proposal to name the ward Priory and proposed reverting to the name of Grantham St Wulfram's. We are content that this alternative ward name would better reflect the communities contained in this ward and propose adopting it as part of our final recommendations.

43 In respect of the opposition to the creation of a parish ward, as noted in our draft recommendations, the Council's proposed ward appeared to split a community centred on Rosedale Drive and we remain unpersuaded that sufficient evidence has been produced to cause us to amend our draft recommendations. We consider that using the parish boundary as a ward boundary in this area would divide a cohesive and continuous community.

44 Subject to the proposed ward name change, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Grantham as final.

45 Overall, our final recommendations for Grantham are for a three-member Grantham St Vincent's ward and for the two-member wards of Grantham Arnoldfield, Grantham Barrowby Gate, Grantham Earlesfield, Grantham Harrowby, Grantham Springfield and Grantham St Wulfram's. These wards would have 4% fewer, 8% more, 1% more, 1% more, 6% fewer, 1% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

Rural South Kesteven

North of Grantham

46 Our draft recommendations for the rural areas to the north of Grantham were for a single-member Loveden Heath ward and the two-member wards of Belmont, Peasecliffe & Ridgeway and Viking.

47 To the north of Grantham, we received opposition and some support for our proposed two-member Peasecliffe & Ridgeway ward. The Council opposed our recommendations on the basis that Ancaster in the north-west of the ward has no community identity with Great Gonerby in the south-west. This view was also

supported by the parish councils of Ancaster and Carlton Scroop & Normanton-on-Cliffe, as well as several district and county councillors. One parish meeting, Honington, did agree with the proposed boundary.

48 We are of the view that none of the submissions received provided sufficient evidence of community identities to justify amending our proposed two-member ward of Peasecliffe & Ridgeway. This ward provides considerably better electoral equality for the area than two single-member wards would produce, being equal to the district average by 2019 (compared with electoral variances of 9% fewer for a single-member Peasecliffe ward and 9% more for a single-member Ridgeway ward). We also received one representation that suggested the name of Loveden for a two-member Peasecliffe & Ridgeway ward. However, given the likely confusion with Loveden Heath ward, we have decided not to adopt this proposal as part of our final recommendations.

South of Grantham

49 To the south of Grantham we recommended the single-member wards of Castle, Dole Wood, Fenside, Glen, Lincrest, Morton and Toller. We also proposed the two-member wards of Belvoir, Casewick and Isaac Newton.

50 We received a number of submissions opposing our ward name of Fenside. It was argued that Aveland is a long-standing name based on the Wapentake of Aveland and the River Ave, and that as the ward boundaries remain largely unchanged so should the name. Having considered these submissions we have decided to recommend that the name of Fenside ward revert to the existing name of Aveland as part of our final recommendations.

51 We also received a submission from Councillor Hill at Lincolnshire County Council. Councillor Hill objected to the inclusion of Kirkby Underwood in Castle ward and suggested it remain in Fenside ward. Councillor Hill suggested placing Bitchfield & Bassingthorpe parish into Castle ward. He also suggested renaming Castle ward and Glen ward by means of switching their names around. We were unable to accept his first suggestion as it would mean that Fenside ward has an electoral variance of 12% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Furthermore, we are not persuaded to adopt Councillor Hill's suggested ward name change. We consider that, while Glen ward contains the settlement of Castle Bytham and Castle ward contains the settlement of Corby Glen, these wards are in fact named after Grimsthorpe Castle and the River Glen respectively. We consider that swapping the proposed ward names would not lessen the risk of confusion and may exacerbate it.

52 We received one submission from Councillor Channell (Hillside ward) who argued that the parish of Greatford looked towards wards to its north. To include it in a Dole Wood ward would produce an electoral variance of 12% and have a consequential effect on our recommendations for the rest of the rural wards. We therefore propose it remains in Casewick ward with which it shares good transport links.

53 Our final recommendations for the Rural South Kesteven area are for the single-member wards of Aveland, Castle, Dole Wood, Glen, Lincrest, Loveden Heath, Morton and Toller. These wards would have 4% more, equal to, equal to, 5% fewer, 2% more, 4% more, 3% fewer and 6% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively. We also recommend the two-member wards of Belmont, Belvoir, Casewick, Isaac Newton, Peasecliffe & Ridgeway and Viking.

These wards would have 3% fewer, 9% more, equal to, 3% fewer, equal to and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Bourne

54 The town of Bourne is located in the east of the district. The town is parished and is the third largest town in the district. Under our draft recommendations, we proposed the three-member ward of Austerby and the two two-member wards of Bourne East and Bourne West.

55 In response to our draft recommendations, we received two submissions covering this area – the submission from the District Council and a submission from Bourne Town Council. Both agreed with our recommendations for wards in the Bourne area. However, the Council requested that the name of Austerby ward be changed to Bourne Austerby to better identify the ward.

56 We have decided to change the ward name of Austerby to Bourne Austerby, as we agree this will help local identification of the ward and better reflect its constituent communities. Our final recommendations for Bourne are for the three-member ward of Bourne Austerby and the two-member wards of Bourne East and Bourne West. These wards would have 7% fewer, 5% fewer and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Stamford

57 The town of Stamford is located in the south-west corner of the district. The town is parished and is the second largest town in the district.

58 The submission from the Council contained no objections to our draft recommendations. We received one other comment on the overall number of councillors for the town. We are content that the amount of councillors allocated to Stamford is appropriate for our proposed council size. Therefore, we confirm our draft recommendations for Stamford as final. These are for the four two-member wards of Stamford All Saints, Stamford St George's, Stamford St John's and Stamford St Mary's. These wards would have 1% more, equal to, 7% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Market Deeping and Deeping St James

59 This area of the district covers the parishes of West Deeping, Deeping St James and Market Deeping. Under a council size of 56, this area is allocated six councillors, the same as present.

60 We received no submissions for this area and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations as final. Our final recommendations are for the three-member wards of Deeping St James and Market & West Deeping. These wards would have 4% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Conclusions

61 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	56	56
Number of electoral wards	30	30
Average number of electors per councillor	1,913	2,057
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	4	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendation

South Kesteven District Council should comprise 56 councillors serving 30 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

62 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.

63 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, South Kesteven 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.

64 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Belton & Manthorpe.

Final recommendation

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

65 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Bourne.

Final recommendation

Bourne Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Austerby East (returning three members), Austerby West (returning two members), Bourne East (returning five members) and Bourne West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

66 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Great Gonerby.

Final recommendation

Great Gonerby Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Gonerby (returning 10 members) and Gonerby Hill (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

67 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without.

Final recommendation

Londonthorpe & Harrowby Without Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bridge End (returning one member) and Harrowby & Spitalgate (returning 12 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

68 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Stamford.

Final recommendation

Stamford Town Council should return 21 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Stamford All Saints North (returning three members), Stamford All Saints South (returning two members), Stamford St George's (returning five members), Stamford St John's (returning six members) and Stamford St Mary's (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

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

Equalities

70 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 Kesteven

71 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for South Kesteven District Council:

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

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for South Kesteven District Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Aveland	1	2,092	2,092	9%	2,132	2,132	4%
2	Belmont	2	3,594	1,797	-6%	3,996	1,998	-3%
3	Belvoir	2	3,982	1,991	4%	4,494	2,247	9%
4	Bourne Austerby	3	4,219	1,406	-26%	5,762	1,921	-7%
5	Bourne East	2	3,463	1,732	-9%	3,912	1,956	-5%
6	Bourne West	2	4,208	2,104	10%	4,246	2,123	3%
7	Casewick	2	4,035	2,018	5%	4,105	2,053	0%
8	Castle	1	1,959	1,959	2%	2,056	2,056	0%
9	Deeping St James	3	5,745	1,915	0%	5,922	1,974	-4%
10	Dole Wood	1	2,043	2,043	7%	2,047	2,047	0%
11	Glen	1	1,944	1,944	2%	1,958	1,958	-5%

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

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12	Grantham Arnoldfield	2	3,329	1,665	-13%	4,459	2,230	8%
13	Grantham Barrowby Gate	2	4,169	2,085	9%	4,170	2,085	1%
14	Grantham Earlesfield	2	4,134	2,067	8%	4,136	2,068	1%
15	Grantham Harrowby	2	3,838	1,919	0%	3,872	1,936	-6%
16	Grantham Springfield	2	3,505	1,753	-8%	4,156	2,078	1%
17	Grantham St Vincent's	3	5,565	1,855	-3%	5,925	1,975	-4%
18	Grantham St Wulfram's	2	4,270	2,135	12%	4,389	2,195	7%
19	Isaac Newton	2	3,803	1,902	-1%	3,975	1,988	-3%
20	Lincrest	1	2,069	2,069	8%	2,107	2,107	2%
21	Loveden Heath	1	2,099	2,099	10%	2,141	2,141	4%
22	Market & West Deeping	3	5,110	1,703	-11%	5,878	1,959	-5%
23	Morton	1	1,913	1,913	0%	1,990	1,990	-3%

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

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2012)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24	Peascliffe & Ridgeway	2	4,032	2,016	5%	4,107	2,054	0%
25	Stamford All Saints	2	4,007	2,004	5%	4,134	2,067	1%
26	Stamford St George's	2	4,107	2,054	7%	4,113	2,057	0%
27	Stamford St John's	2	3,998	1,999	4%	4,387	2,194	7%
28	Stamford St Mary's	2	3,835	1,918	0%	4,229	2,115	3%
29	Toller	1	2,094	2,094	9%	2,186	2,186	6%
30	Viking	2	3,976	1,988	4%	4,183	2,092	2%
	Totals	56	107,137	-	-	115,167	-	-
	Averages	-	-	1,913	-	-	2,057	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by the South Kesteven 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 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 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

