

New electoral arrangements for Worcestershire County Council Draft Recommendations

January 2024

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Worcestershire County Council

Electoral review

January 2024

Translations and other formats:

To get this report in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Licensing:

The mapping in this report is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2024

A note on our mapping:

The maps shown in this report are for illustrative purposes only. Whilst best efforts have been made by our staff to ensure that the maps included in this report are representative of the boundaries described by the text, there may be slight variations between these maps and the large PDF map that accompanies this report, or the digital mapping supplied on our consultation portal. This is due to the way in which the final mapped products are produced. The reader should therefore refer to either the large PDF supplied with this report or the digital mapping for the true likeness of the boundaries intended. The boundaries as shown on either the large PDF map or the digital mapping should always appear identical.

Contents

Introduction	1
Who we are and what we do	1
What is an electoral review?	1
Why Worcestershire?	2
Our proposals for Worcestershire	2
How will the recommendations affect you?	2
Have your say	3
Review timetable	3
Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	4
Number of councillors	5
Councillor allocation and coterminosity	5
Division boundaries consultation	6
Draft recommendations	7
Bromsgrove	8
Malvern Hills	11
Redditch	14
Worcester	16
Wychavon	19
Wyre Forest	23
Conclusions	26
Summary of electoral arrangements	26
Parish electoral arrangements	27
Have your say	31
Equalities	35
Appendices	37
Appendix A	37
Draft recommendations for Worcestershire County Council	37
Appendix B	42
Outline map	42
Appendix C	45
Submissions received	45

Appendix D	47
Glossary and abbreviations	47

Introduction

Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹ We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

2 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Andrew Scallan CBE (Deputy Chair)
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Wallace Sampson OBE
- Liz Treacy

- Ailsa Irvine (Chief Executive)

What is an electoral review?

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

- How many councillors are needed.
- How many county council electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each division.

4 When carrying out an electoral review the Commission has three main considerations:

- Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
- Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
- Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

5 Our task is to strike the best balance between these three considerations when making our recommendations.

¹ Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

6 More detail regarding the powers that we have, as well as further guidance and information about electoral reviews and review process in general, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why Worcestershire?

7 We are conducting a review of Worcestershire County Council ('the Council') as its last review was completed in 2004, and we are required to review the electoral arrangements of every council in England 'from time to time'.² Additionally, some councillors currently represent many more or fewer electors than others. We describe this as 'electoral inequality'. Our aim is to create 'electoral equality', where the number of electors per councillor is as even as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

8 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The divisions in Worcestershire are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

Our proposals for Worcestershire

9 Worcestershire County Council should be represented by 57 councillors, the same number as there are now.

10 Worcestershire should have 52 divisions, the same number as there are now.

11 The boundaries of most divisions should change; 14 will stay the same.

How will the recommendations affect you?

12 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your division name may also change.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the county or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to consider any representations which are based on these issues.

² Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 paragraph 56(1).

Have your say

14 We will consult on the draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 9 January 2024 to 18 March 2024. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to comment on these proposed divisions as the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be in making our final recommendations.

15 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new divisions to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

16 You have until 18 March 2024 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 32 for how to send us your response.

Review timetable

17 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Worcestershire. We then held a period of consultation with the public on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

18 The review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 February 2023	Number of councillors decided
16 May 2023	Start of consultation seeking views on new divisions
19 September 2023	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
9 January 2024	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
18 March 2024	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
2 July 2024	Publication of final recommendations

Analysis and draft recommendations

19 Legislation³ states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors⁴ there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our divisions.

20 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create divisions with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

21 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

	2022	2029
Electorate of Worcestershire	455,549	495,172
Number of councillors	57	57
Average number of electors per councillor	7,992	8,687

22 When the number of electors per councillor in a division is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the division as having 'good electoral equality'. All but five of our proposed divisions for Worcestershire are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Submissions received

23 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

24 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2029, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2024. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 8% by 2029. The district, borough and city councils in Worcestershire provided information to the County Council in support of these forecasts.

³ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

⁴ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

25 During the division consultation, a resident expressed concern that the forecast figures for Bromsgrove district did not accurately reflect future housing developments. We contacted the Council, which supplied us with an updated forecast to accurately reflect new developments in this district. This affected the forecasted variance for Bromsgrove East division. This change was taken into account in the scheme submitted to us by the Council.

26 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

Number of councillors

27 Worcestershire County Council currently has 57 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by the Council and concluded that keeping this number the same would ensure that the authority can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively. We therefore invited proposals for a new pattern of divisions that would be represented by 57 councillors.

28 A submission from a local resident argued for all divisions in Worcestershire to be represented by two councillors. However, insufficient evidence was provided to show how the Council would carry out its duties with more councillors, and no information was provided as to how this proposal would be accommodated in a division pattern for the county. We were therefore not persuaded to move away from our decision on the number of councillors. Our draft recommendations are based on a council size of 57.

Councillor allocation and coterminosity

29 A council size of 57 provides the following allocation of members between the district councils in the county. When conducting reviews of two-tier county councils there are a number of rules that we must follow. Firstly, we must not recommend any divisions that cross an external district boundary. Secondly, we must have regard to district wards within each district. Where possible, we try to use the district wards to form the boundaries of the county divisions. The table below shows the percentage of district wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity.

District	Allocation of councillors	Coterminosity
Bromsgrove	9	70%
Malvern Hills	8	77%
Redditch	8	55%
Worcester	10	63%

Wychavon	12	70%
Wyre Forest	10	50%

30 Redditch Borough Council and Worcester City Council are due to have revised ward boundaries implemented for their council elections in 2024. As these new wards will be implemented before the conclusion of this review of the County Council, we have based our coterminosity calculations on the new ward boundaries, rather than the existing boundaries.

31 We received some submissions during our division consultation that stated that Wychavon district should be allocated an additional councillor and Worcester should be allocated one fewer. Our allocation of county councillors per district is based on the forecast electorates for each district. We have concluded that the allocation of 57 councillors outlined in the table above is accurate and will provide for a division pattern that best reflects our statutory criteria.

Division boundaries consultation

32 We received 48 submissions in response to our consultation on division boundaries. These included county-wide proposals from Worcestershire County Council. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for divisions arrangements in particular areas of the county.

33 The Council scheme provided a pattern of two-councillor divisions for the borough of Redditch and a uniform pattern of one-councillor divisions for the remainder of the districts in Worcestershire. We carefully considered this proposal and were of the view that it would broadly reflect community identities and ensure good electoral equality.

34 Therefore, our draft recommendations are broadly based on the Council's proposals. However, our recommendations also take into account local evidence that we received, which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria and so we identified alternative boundaries.

35 We undertook an in-person tour of Worcestershire. This tour of Worcestershire helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

Draft recommendations

36 Our draft recommendations are for five two-councillor divisions and 47 one-councillor divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

37 The tables and maps on pages 8-28 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Worcestershire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁵ criteria of:


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

38 A summary of our proposed new divisions is set out in the table starting on page 37 and on the large map accompanying this report.

39 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the division boundaries, and the names of our proposed divisions.

⁵ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Bromsgrove



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Alvechurch & Wythall	2	6%
Beacon	1	2%
Bromsgrove Central	1	10%
Bromsgrove East	1	-2%
Bromsgrove South	1	9%
Bromsgrove West	1	11%
Clent Hills	1	10%
Woodvale	1	6%

40 Under a council size of 57, Bromsgrove District Council will have nine councillors, with each councillor representing on average 7% more electors than the county average.

41 The Council's scheme maintained nine single-councillor divisions and improved electoral equality to an extent, but with three divisions forecast to have a variance of greater than 10%. We have adopted aspects of this scheme whilst making changes to improve electoral equality, most notably by creating a new two-councillor division. Minor amendments have also been made to increase coterminosity from 57% to 70%.

Alvechurch & Wythall

42 Our proposed two-councillor division of Alvechurch & Wythall includes the parishes of Alvechurch, Barnt Green, Beoley and Wythall. This proposal differs from the Council's scheme which included more of Wythall village in its Wythall division, using the A435 as an identifiable boundary. This suggestion produces a 12% electoral variance for Wythall division. The Council acknowledged the high electoral variance but argued there was a strong community argument to move more of Wythall village into the division. This argument was also supported by submissions from a local resident and Councillor Kent who argued that the division boundary should reflect the Wythall parish boundary. We explored amending the division boundary to reflect the parish boundary on the basis of the community evidence received. However, this produced a 14% forecast electoral variance. We have therefore decided to take a different approach which will ensure an effective balance of our statutory criteria. We propose a two-councillor Alvechurch & Wythall division which unites Wythall parish in one division, improves coterminosity and results in a forecast electoral variance of 6%.

Bromsgrove Central, Bromsgrove East, Bromsgrove South and Bromsgrove West

43 We have adopted the Council's proposals for these divisions with two minor amendments to Bromsgrove Central in order to follow more identifiable boundaries and improve coterminosity. To improve electoral equality in Bromsgrove East division, we have adopted the Council's proposal to move Tutnall & Cobley parish into Alvechurch & Wythall division.

44 The Council's scheme also addressed the 30% forecast variance in Bromsgrove West division by moving electors into the neighbouring divisions of Bromsgrove Central and Bromsgrove South to produce an electoral variance of 11%. The concentration of electors and the high electoral variances in the central Bromsgrove divisions limited our options to reduce this electoral variance further and we therefore consider that this proposal provides the best balance of our statutory criteria in this area.

Beacon, Clent Hills and Woodvale

45 Our proposed Beacon division consists of Cofton Hackett parish and part of Lickey and Blackwell parish. Our recommendations differ slightly from the Council's proposal for this division by using the Rubery South ward boundary as the division boundary instead of Alvechurch Highway to promote coterminosity in this area.

46 The Council proposed no change to the existing Clent Hills division despite a forecast electoral variance of 13%. The Council argued that finding a natural boundary that did not involve splitting a community to reduce this variance was challenging. Options to improve electoral equality in this area are limited as the majority of the division is located between the boundaries of neighbouring districts which we are not able to cross as part of this review.


47 Councillor Colella proposed a Hagley division consisting of Hagley parish, which is in the existing Clent Hills division. We were not persuaded to adopt this proposal as it would produce poor electoral equality in this area due to too few electors.

48 A resident expressed concern that the rural-urban split of Woodvale division resulted in the rural areas being overlooked. They suggested to group the parishes of Dodford with Grafton and Bournheath with other rural parishes. Our options to move these parishes were limited as Clent Hills is the only neighbouring rural division. Adjusting the boundary to accommodate these parishes would result in poor electoral equality for both Clent Hills and Woodvale divisions. We were therefore not persuaded to adopt this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

49 Our proposed Clent Hills division uses the A491 as a strong, identifiable boundary in this area, and we propose to move the villages of Bell End and Bell Heath into Woodvale division. This reduces the electoral variance of Clent Hills division to 10%. On our tour of the area, we were satisfied that this was an appropriate boundary that promotes good electoral equality. However we would be interested in hearing local opinion on this proposal during the current consultation.

50 Our proposed Woodvale division is forecast good electoral equality by 2029 and we consider it to provide an effective balance of our statutory criteria.

Malvern Hills



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Croome	1	3%
Hallow	1	-4%
Malvern Chase	1	-5%
Malvern Langland	1	-9%
Malvern Link	1	7%
Malvern Trinity	1	-1%

Powick	1	0%
Tenbury	1	7%

51 Under a council of 57, Malvern Hills District Council will have eight councillors, with each councillor representing about the same number of electors as the county average.

52 The Council's scheme for Malvern Hills provided for good electoral equality for all its proposed divisions but did not improve coterminosity from the existing arrangements, which stands at 67%. Consequently, as part of our draft recommendations, we made alterations to the Council's proposals which increased coterminosity to 77%. We are satisfied that this offers the best balance of our statutory criteria for the district.

Hallow and Tenbury

53 Our proposed Hallow division includes the parishes of Astley & Dunley, Holt, Shrawley, Grimley, Martley, Wichenford, Hallow, Kenswick, Lower Broadheath, Doddenham, Knightwick, Broadwas and Cotheridge. This differs from the Council's proposal which also included Rushwick parish, but did not include Doddenham, Knightwick, Broadwas and Cotheridge parishes. However, our proposed Hallow division includes these parishes to achieve better coterminosity with the district ward boundaries in this area whilst also achieving good electoral equality.

54 Our proposed Tenbury division is identical to the Council's proposals and is forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Malvern Link and Malvern Trinity

55 Our proposed Malvern Link division includes the parishes of Rushwick, Bransford, Leigh, Alfrick, Suckley, Lulsley, Newland and part of Malvern Town. This differed from the Council's proposed division which also comprised Doddenham, Knightwick, Broadwas and Cotheridge parishes, but which included Rushwick parish in its proposed Hallow division. Additionally, our proposed Malvern Link division uses the railway line in Malvern Town as a strong, identifiable boundary. This differs from the Council's proposal which diverted the boundary from the railway line to follow Howsell Road. Our tour of the area helped us to conclude that our proposed boundary was appropriate, identifiable and locally recognised.

56 Councillor Whatley expressed concern over Malvern Link division mixing rural and urban communities and urged us to divide the existing division to address this. Splitting up this division and moving the rural and urban areas into neighbouring divisions would result in poor electoral equality in this district. We carefully considered this proposal and concluded that our proposed Malvern Link division provides a good reflection of our statutory criteria.


Croome and Powick

57 Councillor Owenson stated that the existing Croome and Powick divisions were 'unusual' in how they stretched from the Worcester city boundary to the south of the county. They proposed a division in the south centred around the parishes of Welland, Longdon, Eldersfield and other neighbouring parishes whilst suggesting the remainder of the parishes joined the northern divisions. The Council's proposal was to maintain the existing division arrangements subject to the relocation of Newland parish into Malvern Link division to improve coterminosity. We carefully considered these proposals and note that the geography of this area makes moving the northern parishes into another division very difficult in terms of producing a division that has clear boundaries and which effectively balances our statutory criteria. We were therefore not persuaded to do this. We have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Council's proposals for these divisions which have good coterminosity with district ward boundaries and which are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Malvern Chase and Malvern Llangland

58 In the central and south of Malvern town, the Council proposed the two single-member divisions of Malvern Chase and Malvern Llangland. We have decided to base our draft recommendations on these proposed divisions and note that they are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Redditch



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Redditch Central	2	-4%
Redditch East	2	-8%
Redditch South	2	-2%
Redditch West	2	-2%

59 Under a council size of 57, Redditch Borough Council will have eight councillors, with each councillor representing on average 4% fewer electors than the county average.

60 We did not receive any submissions with specific comments about Redditch other than the Council's. All four existing divisions in Redditch are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029. The Council therefore proposed retaining the existing arrangements, subject to minor amendments to increase coterminosity with borough wards from 44% to 55% as well as changing two division names.

Redditch South and Redditch West

61 Our proposed Redditch West division reflects the existing division arrangements as well as the Council's proposals. However, we proposed to rename the division from Redditch North to Redditch West to reflect the geography of the division.


62 Our proposed Redditch South division is based on the Council proposal. Its boundary reflects the Matchborough & Woodrow ward boundary and moves electors south of Alexandra Hospital into Redditch South division to improve coterminosity in this area.

Redditch Central and Redditch East

63 Improving coterminosity in the south of the borough increased the electoral variance of Redditch Central to -11%. Our proposed Redditch Central division reflects the Council's proposal and includes electors east of the footpath that runs adjacent to Tanhouse Lane to reduce the electoral variance of this division to -4%. The Council also proposed to change the existing division name of Arrow Valley West to Redditch West noting that there is no 'local affinity' with the name Arrow Valley. We were persuaded by the community evidence to change the division name. However, we were not convinced that this suggestion appropriately reflected the geography of this division and have therefore put forward the name of Redditch Central.

64 Our proposed Redditch East division is identical to the Council's proposals. The Council suggested to change the name of this division from Arrow Valley East to Redditch East for reasons previously explained in paragraph 63. We were persuaded to adopt this name in our proposals to reflect community identity.

Worcester



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Bedwardine	1	-9%
Claines	1	-10%
Gorse Hill & Warndon	1	-11%
Nunnery	1	-9%
Rainbow Hill	1	8%
Riverside	1	-4%
St John	1	-4%
St Nicholas & Leopard Hill	1	-8%
St Peter	1	-1%
St Stephen	1	-4%

65 Under a council size of 57, Worcester City Council will have 10 councillors, with each councillor representing on average 5% fewer electors than the county average.

66 We have based our proposals on the Council's scheme with some alterations to reflect community identity and the use of stronger and more identifiable boundaries. The divisions are coterminous with 63% of the city wards.

Claines, Gorse Hill & Warndon, Rainbow Hill and St Stephen

67 The Council proposed moving electors north of Green Lane from Rainbow Hill division into St Stephen division and to use the city ward boundary as the division boundary between Rainbow Hill and Gorse Hill & Warndon divisions. These amendments result in good electoral equality for St Stephen and Rainbow Hill divisions; however, they produce a forecast electoral variance of -11% for Gorse Hill & Warndon division. Options to improve this electoral variance would greatly impact on the degree of coterminosity in this area and we were not persuaded to make further changes. Our draft recommendations therefore reflect the Council's proposals in this area, and we are content that they adequately reflect community identities.

68 Our proposed Claines division reflects the Council's proposals. However we have moved a small number of electors into this division from Riverside division at the end of Pitchcroft Lane. We consider this boundary will better reflect local community identities and interests in this area, whilst having regard for the city ward boundaries. This division is also forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Nunnery, St Nicholas & Leopard Hill and St Peter

69 The Council proposed to extend the division boundary of Nunnery to the Warndon parish boundary. However, in our draft recommendations, we propose to extend the boundary into Leopard Hill to account for upcoming developments and also propose that the boundary follow the B463 road. Warndon Parish Council submitted a response urging us to rename the division St Nicholas & Leopard Hill to reflect the city wards that make up this division. Our proposals will involve the parish warding of Warndon Parish and we have therefore adopted the parish ward name of 'Warndon Villages' proposed to us by the parish council as well as its suggested division name. We consider these proposals to better reflect community identities and interests, and also take account of future growth in the area.

70 The Council's proposals included extending the boundary of Nunnery division further south to follow the railway line and the St Peter the Great County parish boundary to improve electoral equality. Councillor Mackay argued that this proposal impacted on coterminosity in this area. Additionally, a resident strongly disagreed with this proposal and argued that this area has no community connection with Nunnery division. They suggested London Road as the feature that divided the communities in this area. We were persuaded by the strong community evidence presented to us in this submission and have adopted this suggestion as part of our draft recommendations to better reflect community identities and interests.

71 For St Peter division, the Council explored how coterminosity could be achieved by extending the division boundary to include the entirety of Battenhall ward. However, this would produce a -16% electoral variance for Riverside division. We considered this electoral variance too high, and we therefore did not adopt this change as part of our draft recommendations. Instead, we have recommended to

extend the boundary south to St Peter the Great County parish boundary to improve electoral equality in the neighbouring Riverside division.


Bedwardine, Riverside and St John

72 Councillor Boatright-Greene, Pinvin Parish Council and a resident raised concerns that the existing Riverside division does not represent communities as it extends across the River Severn. Riverside division already has fewer electors compared to the county average and therefore altering the boundary to follow the River Severn would result in a -38% electoral variance. Other options to improve this variance were explored such as moving electors into Riverside from neighbouring divisions on the eastern side of the river. However, this would result in significantly reduced coterminosity with city wards and would not keep electoral variances at an acceptable level. In light of this, we were not persuaded to adopt any of the options set out above as part of our draft recommendations.

73 The Council proposed to extend the boundary of St John division to include the University of Worcester and surrounding electors to improve the forecast electoral variance from -25% to -7%. On our tour of the area, we were not convinced that this suggested boundary used the most identifiable features. In our draft recommendations, we therefore propose that this boundary follow part of the B426/Henwick Road and Himbleton Road as we consider these to provide stronger, more identifiable boundaries that will help to promote effective and convenient local government. Additionally, to reduce the electoral variance, we have extended the boundary of Riverside division further south to run along the boundary of St Peter the Great County parish.

74 The Council's scheme did not propose any change to the existing Bedwardine division. However, we propose to make a small amendment to the boundary so that it follows the St John ward boundary to improve coterminosity. Councillor Udall was of the view that the existing St John division reflects community identity, but argued that electors north of the B4485/Bransford Road should be moved into the division as this area is the only former part of the village of St John's not within the division. We carefully considered this proposal but were of the view that the forecast electoral variance of -16% that would result for Bedwardine division was too high. In order to ensure good electoral equality, we were not persuaded to adopt this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

Wychavon



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Bowbrook	1	10%
Bredon	1	-6%
Broadway	1	11%
Droitwich East	1	4%
Droitwich West	1	2%
Evesham North West	1	9%

Evesham South	1	10%
Harvington	1	3%
Littletons	1	-5%
Ombersley	1	2%
Pershore	1	14%
Upton Snodsbury	1	6%

75 Under a council size of 57, Wychavon District Council will have 12 councillors, with each councillor representing on average 5% more electors than the county average.

76 We received many submissions during consultation, including that from the Council, specific to the district of Wychavon. The Council's scheme proposed one division with an electoral variance of over 10% and we have based our draft recommendations on its proposals in some areas. However, we have made our own amendments in response to local comments and evidence, and in order to use more identifiable boundaries. The divisions are coterminous with 70% of the district wards.

Bowbrook, Droitwich East, Droitwich West and Ombersley

77 Our proposed Bowbrook division consists of North Claines, Salwarpe, Martin Hussington, Hindlip, Oddington, Hadzor, Himbleton, Huddington and Tibberton parishes. The Council proposed to include electors north of Primsland Way in its Droitwich East division to improve electoral equality in Bowbrook and to reflect community identity. We have adopted this amendment as part of our draft recommendations. The Council also proposed to move Tibberton parish into Upton Snodsbury division to improve electoral equality in Bowbrook division. However, Councillor Rowley argued that Tibberton has strong community links with Bowbrook and looks to the division for many of its services. We were persuaded to retain Tibberton parish in Bowbrook division to reflect community ties and maintain good electoral equality.

78 The Council proposed to amend the boundary between Droitwich East and Droitwich West divisions to improve a -12% anticipated electoral variance for Droitwich West division. The proposed boundary follows a district ward boundary as well as polling district boundaries. On our tour of this area, we were not convinced this proposal would result in strong and identifiable division boundaries. We have therefore used the B4090 as the division boundary as part of our draft recommendations. We consider this boundary to be more locally recognised and will ensure good electoral equality for both divisions.

79 Furthermore, we have adopted the Council's proposal to move electors in the Impney Way area from Ombersley division into Droitwich East division to reflect the

community links this area has with Droitwich town. Our recommended Ombersley division is forecast to have a 2% electoral variance by 2029.

Pershore and Upton Snodsbury

80 Our proposed Pershore division consists of Bishampton, Hill & Moor, Pershore, Pinvin and Wyre Piddle parishes, which reflects the existing arrangements. The Council proposed to make no changes to the existing division despite an anticipated 14% electoral variance, arguing that the parishes that make up this division work closely together in a community liaison group. This was supported by submissions from Pinvin Parish Council and Councillor Boatright-Greene. Councillor Mason suggested Drakes Broughton village could be moved into Pershore division from Upton Snodsbury division as it is becoming 'increasingly urban in character'. This amendment would exacerbate an already high electoral variance and we were therefore not persuaded to adopt this proposal. We were convinced by the local evidence presented to us to adopt the Council's proposal for this division in order to reflect community identities and interests in this area.

81 The Council proposed to move the parishes of Dormston and Kington from Upton Snodsbury division to Harvington division to improve coterminosity. Inkberrow ward is already divided between Ombersley and Harvington divisions under the existing division arrangements. Moving these parishes into Harvington division would not result in Inkberrow ward being fully contained in a single division, which is how we measure coterminosity. We received submissions from Kington & Dormston Parish Council, Councillor Robinson and three residents which contained compelling evidence to retain Kington and Dormston parishes in Upton Snodsbury division. We were persuaded by this evidence and have therefore decided to keep the area in Upton Snodsbury as part of our draft recommendations.

Evesham North West, Evesham South and Harvington

82 The Council proposed to use the A491 and River Avon as a boundary. It proposed to move electors from Evesham South division into Harvington division and include Fairfield Road and the surrounding area in Evesham South division. This results in good equality for both Evesham divisions. A submission from Councillor Day suggested that some electors would need to be moved into Harvington division to produce good electoral equality in this area. Harvington Parish Council's submission noted the close links between the electors in Harvington and Norton district ward with Evesham Town.

83 We received opposing submissions from Councillor Griffiths, the Mid Worcestershire Conservative Association and Evesham Town Council which proposed keeping the entirety of Evesham town within an urban division instead of Harvington which is predominantly rural. The Mid Worcestershire Conservative Association urged us to accept electoral variances of 15% and 12% for Evesham

North West and Evesham South divisions respectively to reflect community identity.


84 We carefully considered the proposals put forward to us and were not persuaded that sufficient evidence was provided to justify the electoral variances that would result from the Mid Worcestershire Conservative Association's proposals. We were persuaded to base our draft recommendations on the Council's proposals for this area and are content that they provide an effective balance our statutory criteria.

Bredon, Broadway and Littletons

85 The Council proposed to move Badsey parish from Littletons division to Broadway division to reduce the anticipated electoral variance from 21% to -5%. We have adopted this amendment as part of our draft recommendations. However, this amendment produced an electoral variance of 11% for Broadway division and to improve this the Council suggested transferring Sedgeberrow parish into Bredon division. On balance, we have decided to accept the 11% forecast electoral variance and retained Sedgeberrow parish in Broadway division. We consider that this will reflect community identities while improving the coterminosity with district wards in this area.

86 Our proposed Bredon division reflects the existing division arrangements and is forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Wyre Forest



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Bewdley	1	-8%
Chaddesley	1	4%
Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall	1	-6%
St Barnabas	1	-10%
St Chads	1	-8%
St Georges	1	-3%
St Johns	1	1%
St Peters	1	-8%
Stourport Areley Kings & Riverside	1	-7%
Stourport Mitton	1	11%

87 Under a council size of 57, Wyre Forest District Council will have 10 councillors, with each councillor representing on average 3% fewer electors than the county average. The divisions are coterminous with 50% of the district wards.

88 A submission we received from a local resident proposed to move the parish of Astley & Dunley, which is located in Malvern Hills District Council, into Wyre Forest District Council. This review is only concerned with internal division boundaries and

we cannot make amendments to the external district boundaries in Worcestershire as part of this review.

89 The Council's scheme for Wyre Forest addressed poor electoral equality in the district and proposed two new single-councillor divisions. Our proposals for the district are identical to the Council's aside from a name change and will result in one division with an electoral variance of over 10%.

Stourport Areley Kings & Riverside and Stourport Mitton

90 The Council proposed to divide the existing two-councillor Stourport-on-Severn division into two single-councillor divisions named Stourport Central and Stourport Mitton to achieve consistent representation across the district. This proposal results in an 11% forecast electoral variance for Stourport Mitton. On our tour of the area, we investigated other boundary options to reduce this variance. However, we were persuaded that the Council's proposal to use Bewdley Road North and Lower Lickhill Road as the division boundary was the most appropriate option as it would avoid dividing communities and provide coterminosity with district ward boundaries. We were persuaded to accept the division name of Stourport Mitton as the name derives from the district ward of Mitton. However, we were not persuaded to adopt the division name of Stourport Central due to questions over whether this proposed division encompassed the entirety of central Stourport-on-Severn. As a result, we are proposing to adopt the name of Stourport Areley Kings & Riverside to reflect the district ward that makes up the majority of this division. We would welcome local comments on this suggestion during the current consultation.

Bewdley, Chaddesley and Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall

91 Our proposed Bewdley division comprises of Rock, Ribbesford and Upper Arley parishes as well as parts of Bewdley and Kidderminster Foreign parishes. We were persuaded to adopt the Council's proposal to include electors from the Bewdley Wood area to reduce the forecast electoral variance from -13% to -8%.

92 Our proposed Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall division comprises parts of Bewdley, Kidderminster Foreign parishes, as well as Wolverley & Cookley parish. We were persuaded to adopt the Council's suggestion of amending the boundary and move the Lea Castle development from Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall into Chaddesley division. This results in significantly improved electoral equality for both divisions.

St Barnabas, St Chads, St Georges, St Johns and St Peters

93 Our proposed St Barnabas division remains unchanged from the existing arrangements and is forecast to have an electoral variance of -10% by 2029. We are content that this division provides a good reflection of our statutory criteria.

94 The Council's proposal for St Georges division uses the River Stour and Birmingham Road as its boundaries. The Council also proposed renaming St Georges and St Oswalds division to St Georges to reflect that St Oswalds Church is permanently closed. We have decided to adopt this proposal as part of our draft recommendations as it reduces the electoral variance of the division from -12% to -3% and uses strong and identifiable boundaries to reflect community identity.

95 The Council's proposed St Chads division includes the electors north of Comberton Road and extends south along the railway line to include the Aggborough area. In order to ensure good electoral equality in St Peters division we instead propose to extend St Chads division to Aggborough Stadium and move the electors of south Aggborough into St Peters division. This results in a -8% forecast electoral variance for both St Chads and St Peters divisions. We also investigated moving the Spennells area into St Peters division to reflect community identity in this area. However, this produced a -39% electoral variance for Chaddesley division and we were therefore not persuaded to adopt this option as part of our draft recommendations.

96 Our recommended St Peters division differs from the existing arrangements as it currently extends into central Kidderminster. We have adopted the Council's scheme to move the boundary of St Peters division to The Ringway and Stourport Road to improve electoral equality, noting that a resident stressed that the existing division was far too large. Alongside improved electoral equality, we consider our proposed division to better reflect community identities and that it will use locally recognised boundaries. The Council also proposed to rename the division from St Marys to St Peters arguing that the new division arrangement results in St Marys Church no longer being a part of the division. We were persuaded by this evidence to adopt the name of St Peters for this division.

Conclusions

97 The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality in Worcestershire, referencing the 2022 and 2029 electorate figures against the proposed number of councillors and divisions. A full list of divisions, names and their corresponding electoral variances can be found at Appendix A at the back of this report. An outline map of the wards is provided at Appendix B.

Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2022	2029
Number of councillors	57	57
Number of electoral divisions	52	52
Average number of electors per councillor	7,992	8,687
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	10	5
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Draft recommendations

Worcestershire County Council should be made up of 57 councillors serving 52 divisions representing 47 single-councillor divisions and five two-councillor divisions. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed divisions for Worcestershire.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Worcestershire on our interactive maps at www.lgbce.org.uk

Parish electoral arrangements

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

99 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, Worcestershire's constituents districts 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.

100 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Belbroughton, Droitwich Spa, Kidderminster, Kidderminster Foreign, Malvern, Stourport-on-Severn, Warndon and Wolverley & Cookley.

101 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Belbroughton parish.

Draft recommendations

Belbroughton Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Belbroughton East	4
Belbroughton West	4

102 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Droitwich Spa parish.

Draft recommendations

Droitwich Spa Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing nine wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Droitwich Central	2
Droitwich Chawson	2
Droitwich Copcut North	1

Droitwich Copcut South	2
Droitwich East	4
Droitwich Tagwell	2
Droitwich West	3
Droitwich Witton East	1
Droitwich Witton West	1

103 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Kidderminster parish.

Draft recommendations

Kidderminster Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing 10 wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Aggborough North	1
Aggborough South & Hill Grove	1
Blakebrook & Habberley South	3
Broadwaters	3
Foley Park & Hoobrock	2
Franche & Habberley North	3
Greenhill	1
Offmore & Comberton	2
Spennells	1
Sutton Farm	1

104 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Kidderminster Foreign parish.

Draft recommendations

Kidderminster Foreign Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Kidderminster Foreign North	4
Kidderminster Foreign South	3

105 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Malvern parish.

Draft recommendations

Malvern Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Chase	4
Great Malvern	3
Link	3
Pickersleigh	2
Pound Bank	1
St Joseph's	2
Upper Howsell	2
West	3

106 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Stourport-on-Severn parish.

Draft recommendations

Stourport-on-Severn Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Areley Kings East	2
Areley Kings West	3
Central	2
Lickhill East	1
Lickhill West	1
North	5
Stour & Wilden	4

107 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Warndon parish.

Draft recommendations

Warndon Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Warndon Villages Central	3

Warndon Villages North	4
Warndon Villages South	1

108 We are providing revised electoral parish arrangements for Wolverley & Cookley parish.

Draft recommendations

Wolverley & Cookley Parish Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Wolverley & Cookley	10
Lea Castle	4

Have your say

109 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

110 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Worcestershire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

111 Our website is the best way to keep up to date with progress on the review and to have your say www.lgbce.org.uk

112 Each review has its own page with details of the timetable for the review, information about its different stages and interactive mapping.

113 Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Worcestershire)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
PO Box 133
Blyth
NE24 9FE

114 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Worcestershire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of electors.
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

115 A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of electors.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

116 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of electors as elsewhere in Worcestershire?

117 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

118 Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

119 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

120 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers. This includes your name, postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

121 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

122 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft

Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for Worcestershire in 2025.

Equalities

123 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.

Appendices

Appendix A

Draft recommendations for Worcestershire County Council

Division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
BROMSGROVE								
1	Alvechurch & Wythall	2	16,970	8,485	6%	18,478	9,239	6%
2	Beacon	1	8,517	8,517	7%	8,865	8,865	2%
3	Bromsgrove Central	1	9,041	9,041	13%	9,533	9,533	10%
4	Bromsgrove East	1	6,802	6,802	-15%	8,533	8,533	-2%
5	Bromsgrove South	1	8,813	8,813	10%	9,502	9,502	9%
6	Bromsgrove West	1	6,219	6,219	-22%	9,607	9,607	11%
7	Clent Hills	1	9,156	9,156	15%	9,588	9,588	10%
8	Woodvale	1	8,777	8,777	10%	9,199	9,199	6%
MALVERN HILLS								
9	Croome	1	7,644	7,644	-4%	8,930	8,930	3%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
10	Hallow	1	7,246	7,246	-9%	8,339	8,339	-4%
11	Malvern Chase	1	7,355	7,355	-8%	8,212	8,212	-5%
12	Malvern Langland	1	7,514	7,514	-6%	7,946	7,946	-9%
13	Malvern Link	1	7,717	7,714	-3%	9,314	9,314	7%
14	Malvern Trinity	1	8,119	8,119	2%	8,561	8,561	-1%
15	Powick	1	8,126	8,126	2%	8,675	8,675	0%
16	Tenbury	1	8,391	8,391	5%	9,305	9,305	7%
REDDITCH								
17	Redditch Central	2	16,133	8,067	1%	16,733	8,367	-4%
18	Redditch East	2	15,261	7,631	-5%	15,926	7,963	-8%
19	Redditch South	2	16,216	8,108	1%	17,010	8,505	-2%
20	Redditch West	2	15,842	7,921	-1%	17,090	8,545	-2%
WORCESTER								
21	Bedwardine	1	7,429	7,429	-7%	7,885	7,885	-9%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
22	Claines	1	7,518	7,518	-6%	7,849	7,849	-10%
23	Gorse Hill & Warndon	1	7,414	7,414	-7%	7,759	7,759	-11%
24	Nunnery	1	7,505	7,505	-6%	7,930	7,930	-9%
25	Rainbow Hill	1	8,404	8,404	5%	9,391	9,391	8%
26	Riverside	1	7,745	7,745	-3%	8,299	8,299	-4%
27	St John	1	7,814	7,814	-2%	8,324	8,324	-4%
28	St Nicholas & Leopard Hill	1	7,828	7,828	-2%	8,014	8,014	-8%
29	St Peter	1	8,136	8,136	2%	8,624	8,624	-1%
30	St Stephen	1	8,031	8,031	0%	8,323	8,323	-4%
WYCHAVON								
31	Bowbrook	1	8,609	8,609	8%	9,537	9,537	10%
32	Bredon	1	7,855	7,855	-1%	8,204	8,204	-6%
33	Broadway	1	9,059	9,059	13%	9,683	9,683	11%
34	Droitwich East	1	8,369	8,369	5%	9,029	9,029	4%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
35	Droitwich West	1	8,474	8,474	6%	8,904	8,904	2%
36	Evesham North West	1	8,352	8,352	5%	9,433	9,433	9%
37	Evesham South	1	8,944	8,944	12%	9,539	9,539	10%
38	Harvington	1	8,645	8,645	8%	8,972	8,972	3%
39	Littletons	1	7,393	7,393	-7%	8,260	8,260	-5%
40	Ombersley	1	8,546	8,546	7%	8,885	8,885	2%
41	Pershore	1	9,080	9,080	14%	9,896	9,896	14%
42	Upton Snodsbury	1	8,387	8,387	5%	9,231	9,231	6%
WYRE FOREST								
43	Bewdley	1	7,642	7,642	-4%	7,965	7,965	-8%
44	Chaddesley	1	7,064	7,064	-12%	9,010	9,010	4%
45	Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall	1	7,406	7,406	-7%	8,127	8,127	-6%
46	St Barnabas	1	7,448	7,448	-7%	7,815	7,815	-10%
47	St Chads	1	7,111	7,111	-11%	7,965	7,965	-8%


	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2022)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
48	St Georges	1	7,743	7,743	-3%	8,443	8,443	-3%
49	St Johns	1	8,366	8,366	5%	8,765	8,765	1%
50	St Peters	1	7,579	7,579	-5%	7,998	7,998	-8%
51	Stourport Areley Kings & Riverside	1	6,957	6,957	-13%	8,093	8,093	-7%
52	Stourport Mitton	1	8,807	8,807	10%	9,674	9,674	11%
Totals		57	455,549	–	–	495,172	–	–
Averages		–	–	7,992	–	–	8,687	–

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

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

Appendix B

Outline map



Number	Division name
1	Alvechurch & Wythall
2	Beacon
3	Bromsgrove Central
4	Bromsgrove East
5	Bromsgrove South
6	Bromsgrove West
7	Clent Hills
8	Woodvale
9	Croome

10	Hallow
11	Malvern Chase
12	Malvern Langland
13	Malvern Link
14	Malvern Trinity
15	Powick
16	Tenbury
17	Redditch Central
18	Redditch East
19	Redditch South
20	Redditch West
21	Bedwardine
22	Claines
23	Gorse Hill & Warndon
24	Nunnery
25	Rainbow Hill
26	Riverside
27	St John
28	St Nicholas & Leopard Hill
29	St Peter
30	St Stephen
31	Bowbrook
32	Bredon
33	Broadway
34	Droitwich East
35	Droitwich West
36	Evesham North West
37	Evesham South
38	Harvington
39	Littletons
40	Ombersley
41	Pershore
42	Upton Snodsbury
43	Bewdley
44	Chaddesley
45	Cookley, Wolverley & Wribbenhall
46	St Barnabas
47	St Chads
48	St Georges
49	St Johns
50	St Peters
51	Stourport Areley Kings & Riverside

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/worcestershire

Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at:

www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/worcestershire

Local Authority

- Worcestershire County Council

Political Groups

- Mid Worcestershire Conservative Association

Councillors

- Councillor M. Allen (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor D. Boatright-Greene (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor S. Colella (Bromsgrove District Council)
- Councillor C. Day (Wychavon District Council)
- Councillor E. Eyre (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor P. Griffiths (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor D. Harrison (Malvern Hills District Council)
- Councillor A. Kent (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor S. Mackay (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor T. Mason (Peopleton Parish Council)
- Councillor J. Owenson (Malvern Hills District Council)
- Councillor L. Robinson (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor M. Rowley (Wychavon District Council)
- Councillor R. Udall (Worcestershire County Council)
- Councillor M. Victory (Malvern Hills District Council)
- Councillor P. Whatley (Malvern Hills District Council)

Local Organisations

- Worcestershire Polish Association

Parish and Town Councils

- Churchill & Blakedown Parish Council
- Drakes Broughton & Wadborough with Pirton Parish Council

- Earls Croome Parish Council
- Evesham Town Council
- Grimley Parish Council
- Harvington Parish Council
- Hindlip, Martin Hussingtree & Salwarpe Parish Council
- Kempsey Parish Council
- Kington & Dormston Parish Council
- Longdon Queenhill & Holdfast Parish Council
- Pinvin Parish Council
- Upton upon Severn Parish Council
- Warndon Parish Council
- Whittington Parish Council
- Severn Stoke & Croome d'Abitot Parish Council
- Stoulton Parish Council

Local Residents

- 13 local residents

Appendix D

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. We only take account of electors registered specifically for local elections during our reviews.
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 can vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at 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

Translations and other formats:

To get this report in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

Licensing:

The mapping in this report is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2024

A note on our mapping:

The maps shown in this report are for illustrative purposes only. Whilst best efforts have been made by our staff to ensure that the maps included in this report are representative of the boundaries described by the text, there may be slight variations between these maps and the large PDF map that accompanies this report, or the digital mapping supplied on our consultation portal. This is due to the way in which the final mapped products are produced. The reader should therefore refer to either the large PDF supplied with this report or the digital mapping for the true likeness of the boundaries intended. The boundaries as shown on either the large PDF map or the digital mapping should always appear identical.

The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.

Local Government Boundary Commission for
England
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street, London
SW1H 0TL

Telephone: 0330 500 1525
Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Online: www.lgbce.org.uk
Twitter: @LGBCE