


The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England



New electoral arrangements for Essex County Council Final Recommendations

July 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 Essex?	3
Our proposals for Essex	3
How will the recommendations affect you?	3
Review timetable	4
Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Number of councillors	6
Councillor allocation and coterminosity	6
Division boundaries consultation	7
Draft recommendations consultation	8
Final recommendations	8
Basildon	9
Braintree	12
Brentwood	14
Castle Point	16
Chelmsford	17
Colchester	20
Epping Forest	23
Harlow	26
Maldon	28
Rochford	30
Tendring	31
Uttlesford	33
Conclusions	36
Summary of electoral arrangements	36
Parish electoral arrangements	37
What happens next?	40
Equalities	42

Appendices	44
Appendix A	44
Final recommendations for Essex County Council	44
Appendix B	52
Outline map	52
Appendix C	55
Submissions received	55
Appendix D	58
Glossary and abbreviations	58

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) | • Steve Robinson |
| • Andrew Scallan CBE
(Deputy Chair) | • Wallace Sampson OBE |
| • Amanda Nobbs 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 wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each ward or 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 the further guidance and information about electoral reviews and review process in general, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why Essex?

7 We are conducting a review of Essex County Council ('the Council') as its last review was completed in 2002, and we are required to review the electoral arrangements of every council in England 'from time to time'.² 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 Essex 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 Essex

9 Essex should be represented by 78 councillors, three more than there are now.

10 Essex should have 78 divisions, eight more than there are now.

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

12 We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Essex.

How will the recommendations affect you?

13 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.

14 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).

Review timetable

15 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Essex. We then held two periods of consultation with the public on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our final recommendations.

16 The review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 March 2023	Number of councillors decided
28 March 2023	Start of consultation seeking views on new divisions
31 July 2023	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
28 November 2023	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
19 February 2024	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
9 July 2024	Publication of final recommendations

Analysis and final recommendations

17 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.

18 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.

19 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 Essex	1,116,845	1,236,124
Number of councillors	78	78
Average number of electors per councillor	14,319	15,848

20 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'. Seventy-one of our proposed divisions for Essex are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

Submissions received

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

Electorate figures

22 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 11% by 2029.

23 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 final recommendations.

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.

Number of councillors

24 Essex Council currently has 75 councillors. We initially looked at evidence provided by the Council and concluded that increasing this number by two would ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

25 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of divisions that would be represented by 77 councillors. At the beginning of the review the Council requested that this review be conducted as a 'single-member division' review.⁵ The Commission agreed to this request, and we invited proposals for divisions that would each be represented by one councillor.

26 If a review is conducted as a single-member review, there is a presumption in legislation that the Council have a uniform pattern of single-councillor divisions. Accordingly, we will aim to deliver a pattern of single-member divisions. However, in all cases this consideration will not take precedence over our other statutory criteria, and we will not recommend a uniform pattern of single-member divisions if, in our view or as is shown in evidence provided to us, it is not compatible with our other statutory criteria.

27 The Council, in its proposal on division patterns, proposed that a 78-member division pattern would allow for a more even distribution of councillors between the boroughs and districts across the county than 77 members. We have accepted this argument, and therefore propose 78 divisions in these final recommendations.

28 We received no submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on our draft recommendations. We have therefore maintained 78 councillors for our final recommendations.

Councillor allocation and coterminosity

29 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 the district boundary. Secondly, we must have regard for the district/borough wards that exist within each area. Where possible we try to use the district/borough wards to form the boundaries of the county divisions. The table below shows the allocation of county councillors between the district and borough councils in the county. It also shows the percentage of district/borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity.

⁵ Section 57 of Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

District/Borough	Allocation of councillors	Coterminosity
Basildon	9	36%
Braintree	8	81%
Brentwood	4	77%
Castle Point	5	77%
Chelmsford	9	71%
Colchester	9	71%
Epping Forest	7	72%
Harlow	5	64%
Maldon	4	94%
Rochford	5	69%
Tendring	8	78%
Uttlesford	5	91%

30 Five district/borough councils (Basildon, Brentwood, Castle Point, Epping Forest and Harlow) had revised ward boundaries implemented for their council elections in 2024 and future years. 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.

Division boundaries consultation

31 We received 64 submissions in response to our consultation on division boundaries. These included one county-wide proposal from the County Council, which was supported by the Conservative Group as well as Cllr L. Barker, Cllr R. Playle and Cllr L. Bowers-Flint. Proposals for individual districts and boroughs were received from various political groups across Essex in their local areas. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

32 The one county-wide scheme provided a uniform pattern of one-councillor divisions for Essex. We carefully considered the proposals received and were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the authority and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

33 Our draft recommendations also took 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.

34 We undertook a detailed virtual tour of Essex during preparation of our draft recommendations, and a physical tour during preparation of our final recommendations. These tours helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

35 Our draft recommendations were for 78 one-councillor divisions. We considered that our draft recommendations would provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

Draft recommendations consultation

36 We received 110 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These included comments across the county from Essex County Council, and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups on the Council. The majority of the other submissions focused on specific areas, particularly our proposals in Epping Forest, Brentwood, and Uttlesford.

Final recommendations

37 Our final recommendations are for 78 one-councillor divisions. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

38 Our final recommendations are based on the draft recommendations with modifications to the divisions in several areas of the county based on the submissions received. In particular, we have modified our draft recommendations in Brentwood and Colchester based on evidence received from local organisations, and made minor modifications in other areas of the county.


39 The tables and maps on pages 9–36 detail our final recommendations for each area of Essex. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁶ criteria of:

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

40 A summary of our proposed new divisions is set out in the table starting on page 45 and on the large map accompanying this report.

⁶ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Basildon



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Billericay North	1	8%
Burstead	1	11%
Castledon & Crouch	1	-1%
Gloucester Park	1	9%
Laindon Town	1	6%
Pitsea	1	4%
Vange	1	8%
Westley Heights	1	5%
Wickford East & Bowers Gifford	1	7%

41 Under a Council size of 78, Basildon has an allocation of nine councillors. Several submissions noted the difficulty of achieving a high level of coterminosity with relatively large borough wards in place across Basildon.

42 Essex County Council reiterated its support for different proposals that it made for the area during the initial consultation but did not offer fresh evidence in support of these proposals. The Liberal Democrats broadly supported the draft recommendations, but made proposals for modest changes to one boundary, and two names.

Billericay North, Burstead, and Langdon Town

43 Cllr L. Fryerns suggested that the area of our proposed Burstead division south of the A127 should be restored to a Laindon-based division. He described this area as including ‘the heart of Laindon’ and noted that it included St Nicholas Church. While we recognise the community evidence provided, placing this area in Laindon division without other changes would leave Laindon with a 24% electoral variance – well beyond the bounds of good electoral equality. We have therefore not adopted this proposal.

44 We received varying proposals for the name of the division known as Burstead in our draft recommendations. The Liberal Democrats suggested naming this division ‘Burstead & Billericay South’, while Cllr A. Schrader suggested ‘Billericay South & Laindon’. Cllr Schrader also noted several aspects of the boundaries of this division but did not offer alternative proposals.

45 We considered the name of the division carefully but, in the absence of any clear consensus as to the most appropriate name, we are not minded to alter our draft recommendations in this area. The principal authority is able to initiate a process under Section 59 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to change the name of this or any other division across the county.

Castledon & Crouch, Gloucester Park, Pitsea, Vange, Westley Heights, and Wickford East & Bowers Gifford

46 The Liberal Democrats broadly supported our draft recommendations for these divisions but suggested one amendment to the boundaries. They proposed that the area of Castledon & Crouch division south of the A127 should be added to Pitsea division. In contrast, Cllr K. Smith, while supporting the draft recommendations, provided evidence that the residents of this area look towards Wickford, as opposed to Pitsea or Basildon.

47 We considered this area carefully and recognise that the decision is finely balanced. However, we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence related to community identity has been provided to justify altering our draft recommendations. While the A127 would undoubtedly offer a strong boundary, the move would worsen

the electoral equality of both Castledon & Crouch and Pitsea divisions, taking electors from a division with negative variance and adding them to a division with a positive variance.

48 Cllr M. Buckley expressed concern at our proposed Wickford North East & Bowers Gifford division, noting that access across the A127 between the northern and southern sections of the division was not straightforward.

49 We viewed this area on our tour of Essex. While we agree there are issues in respect of access, we have been unable to identify an alternative pattern of divisions that better meets our statutory criteria. For example, placing the section of this division south of the A127 into the neighbouring Pitsea division would leave this division with 15% more electors than average – a level of electoral inequality we will recommend only in the most exceptional circumstances. While acknowledging the point that Cllr Buckley makes, we are not persuaded to alter our draft recommendations in this area and confirm them as final.

50 Basildon Council proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between Gloucester Park and Vange divisions, to place Austen Road, Pankhurst Drive and neighbouring streets in Vange. Basildon Council suggested that the only access from these streets was onto Faraday Way. We are persuaded that this change is likely to improve the accessibility of Vange division and have amended our draft recommendations accordingly.

51 We received no proposals for changes to Westley Heights division, which was supported by the Liberal Democrats and Cllr K. Smith. We confirm our draft recommendations for this division and the remainder of this area as final.

Braintree



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Bocking	1	5%
Braintree Eastern	1	-8%
Braintree Town	1	-1%
Halstead	1	7%
Hedingham	1	-6%
Three Fields & Great Notley	1	-3%
Witham Town	1	2%
Witham West & Rural	1	0%

Bocking, Braintree Eastern, Braintree Town, Halstead, Hedingham, Three Fields & Great Notley, Witham Town, and Witham West & Rural


52 Braintree district is allocated eight councillors under a council size of 78. Our draft recommendations for this district were broadly welcomed.

53 Essex County Council, the Conservative Group, and a sizeable number of local organisations and councillors supported our draft recommendations, with several submissions welcoming the clear distinction between urban- and rural-based divisions. In response to a question raised in our draft recommendation report, Cllr G. Butland provided evidence of links between the parishes of Great Notley and Black Notley but did not argue strongly for them to be placed in the same division. Placing these parishes together in either Three Fields & Great Notley or Witham West & Rural divisions would lead to both divisions having poor electoral equality without significant other changes. Given the broad support for our draft recommendations, we are not persuaded to make this change.

54 The Liberal Democrat Group, while broadly welcoming the draft recommendations, suggested that Black Notley could be added to Three Fields & Great Notley division, with Finchingfield and Wethersfield parishes moved into Hedingham to compensate. We considered this, but the change would not only increase the geographic size of the already large Hedingham division but would leave Witham West & Rural with 19% fewer electors per councillor than average. We have therefore not adopted this proposal.

55 A resident suggested that the schools along Rickstones Road should be placed in Witham Town, rather than Braintree Eastern division. While we consider that the schools are likely to serve those in Witham, this change would split Rivenhall parish between divisions, requiring the creation of a parish ward with very few electors. We do not consider that this is compatible with the need to ensure effective and convenient local government and have not adopted this proposal. We confirm our draft recommendations in this area, and across Braintree, as final.

Brentwood



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Brentwood Hutton	1	8%
Brentwood North	1	8%
Brentwood Rural	1	0%
Brentwood South	1	12%

Brentwood Hutton and Brentwood South

56 Discussion of our draft recommendations for Brentwood focused on these two divisions, and specifically our decision to move away from the existing pattern of divisions to place West Horndon parish in Brentwood South division, a decision which allowed all of Hutton South borough ward to be brought within Brentwood Hutton division.

57 This proposal attracted a mixed response. Essex County Council, Cllr D. Kendall, Brentwood & Ongar Liberal Democrats, West Horndon Parish Council, and the Liberal Democrat and Conservative groups on Essex County Council argued against our draft recommendations. They suggested that the key community links of West Horndon were along the A128, towards Herongate and Ingrave, rather than to the remainder of Brentwood South division. The parish council provided specific evidence of links to Herongate & Ingrave parish, citing planning issues around Dunton Hills Garden Village, and transport links along the A127 and A128.


58 Brentwood Council Labour Group broadly supported our proposed boundaries in this area but offered no fresh evidence to support their retention.

59 We have considered all the submissions in this area carefully. We are persuaded to amend our draft recommendations and adopt the proposal of the Council and others to revert to the existing division boundaries in this area as part of our final recommendations. We acknowledge that this leaves Hutton South ward split between divisions, as well as Brentwood South having a relatively high electoral variance of 12%. However, we consider that this is outweighed by the robust evidence provided that West Horndon shares community identities with the adjoining communities in Brentwood Hutton division.

Brentwood North and Brentwood Rural

60 The draft recommendations in this area were supported by Essex County Council, the Liberal Democrat Group and the Conservative Group. The Labour Group on Brentwood Council proposed alternative names for divisions, suggesting that Brentwood North could be renamed as either Brentwood Shenfield or Brentwood Pilgrims Hatch. They suggested that this would avoid confusion between divisions and wards sharing similar names. We considered this carefully, but in light of the broad support for our draft recommendations, we are not persuaded to change the names of these divisions. As with other divisions across Essex, the principal council can initiate a procedure to alter division names if desired. We confirm our draft recommendations for Brentwood North and Brentwood Rural divisions as final.

Castle Point




Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Canvey Island East	1	0%
Canvey Island West	1	-7%
Hadleigh	1	-14%
South Benfleet	1	-11%
Thundersley	1	-9%

Canvey Island East, Canvey Island West, Hadleigh, South Benfleet, and Thundersley

61 No proposals to change the boundaries of divisions in Castle Point were received. Our draft recommendations were supported by Essex County Council, the Liberal Democrat Group, Conservative Group, Canvey Residents' Alliance and Canvey Island Town Council, as well as several residents. Despite the high negative electoral variances in some divisions, we consider our recommendations provide an effective balance between our statutory criteria and therefore confirm them as final.

Chelmsford



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Broomfield & Writtle	1	7%
Chelmer	1	9%
Chelmsford Central	1	-4%
Chelmsford North	1	1%
Chelmsford Springfield	1	3%
Chelmsford West	1	-9%
Danbury & The Hanningfields	1	6%
Great Baddow & Galleywood	1	5%
Woodham Ferrers	1	-4%

Broomfield & Writtle and Chelmer

62 Discussion of these divisions focused around the area of Chelmsford Garden parish, and the newly formed Community Council in this area. Our draft

recommendations split Chelmsford Garden parish between Chelmer and Broomfield & Writtle divisions, following ward boundaries where possible, and ensuring that both divisions had good electoral equality, albeit with relatively high variances of 9% and 7%, respectively.

63 Chelmsford Garden Community Council, Chelmsford City Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed uniting Chelmsford Garden parish within Chelmer division, moving the northern section of Chelmsford Garden parish and Little Waltham parish into Chelmer division and compensating for this by moving Great & Little Leighs parish into Broomfield & Writtle division. Some evidence was provided of schooling links, and it was argued that the rapidly developing nature of the Chelmsford Garden area should be reflected in a single division.

64 Our draft recommendations for this area were supported by Essex County Council, the Conservative Group on the Council and Chelmsford Constituency Conservative Association. The latter suggested that the proposal from the City Council had a political motivation. This last point is not one which we can consider. All of our decisions in this review have been informed by our three statutory criteria of electoral equality, community identities and interests, and effective and convenient local government.

65 We have carefully considered all the submissions received for this area. While the decision is finely balanced, we are not persuaded to alter our draft recommendations in this area. Adopting the proposed changes would result in Broomfield & Writtle division having a relatively high electoral variance of 11%. While there are areas of Essex where we are recommending higher variances, we were not persuaded that sufficient evidence was received in respect of this specific area to justify the electoral inequality that would result.

66 We also note that the proposed change would split the city ward of Boreham & The Leighs with no other ward being united within a single division. It would also add to the size of the revised Broomfield & Writtle division. While large divisions in rural areas are more likely to occur, a division running from the north-eastern to south-western extremity of the City Council area is one we believe should be avoided, especially where alternatives exist which attracted support and evidence. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for Broomfield & Writtle and Chelmer divisions as final.


Chelmsford Central, Chelmsford North, Chelmsford Springfield, Chelmsford West, Danbury & The Hanningfields, Great Baddow & Galleywood, and Woodham Ferrers

67 We received an alternative proposal for these divisions, and the rest of Chelmsford, from a resident with the support of Chelmsford Labour Party. This proposal was based on a hypothetical redrawing of a large number of City Council wards, which cannot be altered as part of this review. When recommending divisions, we must consider the existing City Council wards rather than those possibly arising from future changes. We have therefore not adopted the proposals from the resident.

68 The remainder of the divisions attracted broad support, including from the Council, Conservative Group and Liberal Democrat Group. Cllr C. Davidson expressed particular support for our proposed Chelmsford North division.

69 Cllr A. McQuiggan and Galleywood Parish Council suggested that the order of the names within the Great Barrow & Galleywood division be changed. We note that the existing division in this area is named just 'Great Baddow', and that a change to put the smaller settlement first in the name would be inconsistent with the arguments put forward with regard to name changes in Epping Forest (discussed below at paragraph 83). We are not persuaded to amend the name of our proposed division here, and confirm our recommendations for the names and boundaries of divisions across Chelmsford as final.

Colchester



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Colchester Abbey	1	8%
Colchester Lexden	1	-2%
Colchester Maypole	1	5%
Colchester North	1	8%
Colchester St Johns	1	5%
Constable	1	4%
Mersea & Tiptree	1	9%
Stanway & Marks Tey	1	-1%
Wivenhoe St Andrew	1	10%

Colchester Abbey, Colchester Lexden, Colchester Maypole, Colchester North, Colchester St Johns, Constable, and Wivenhoe St Andrew

70 Our draft recommendations for the boundaries of these divisions were supported by Essex County Council, the Conservative Group, and the Liberal Democrat Group. Essex County Council proposed renaming the division known as Colchester City in our draft recommendations as Colchester North, noting that the city extended significantly beyond this division. We are persuaded to adopt this suggestion and alter our draft recommendations accordingly.

71 The Council also suggested that the name of Colchester Lexden division could be expanded to include the settlement of Braiswick. We considered this but note that there is a Colchester City Council ward named Lexden & Braiswick, with very different boundaries to Lexden division. While we will, where appropriate, recommend names for divisions which mirror those of wards, we consider that in this case, the different areas covered would have the potential to lead to confusion, which would not be compatible with effective and convenient local government. We have therefore not adopted the proposed name change.

72 A resident suggested that the area between Crouch Street and Sheepen Road could be transferred from Colchester North to Colchester Lexden division, noting that this area was a popular leisure destination for Lexden residents. While accepting this evidence, we have no reason to believe that the leisure facilities in this area would not attract residents from Colchester North division, and the rest of the city. The proposed change would not improve electoral equality, and we decided not to adopt it as part of our final recommendations.

73 Cllr J. Law provided evidence of community identity relating to the Mylands East area and suggested that the boundary in this area could be moved to Mill Road, as opposed to our draft recommendations which placed the entire area in a rural-based Constable division.

74 We acknowledged in our draft recommendations report the difficulty in identifying a division pattern that fully reflected the community identity of the Mylands East area. We carefully considered the additional material provided by Cllr Law but have been unable to adopt her proposals. The area of Mylands East south of Mill Road contains roughly 1,800 electors, and adding these to the Colchester St Johns division would, in the absence of any compensating change, leave this division with an 18% electoral variance. All the neighbouring divisions have relatively high variances, and there is no solution that offers good electoral equality without completely recasting the division map of Colchester. Given the broad support received for the draft recommendations, we are not persuaded to alter them in this area.

Mersea & Tiptree and Stanway & Marks Tey

75 Our draft recommendations in this area were for two predominantly rural divisions, one ranging from Stanway to West Mersea, and one covering the south-west of the City Council area, from Marks Tey to Great & Little Wigborough. This attracted a mixed response, with support from the Council and Liberal Democrat groups. However, Stanway Parish Council objected to the parish being divided


between divisions, and an alternative proposal was put forward by the Harwich & North Essex Conservative Association (HNECA), which supported the draft recommendations for the rest of the Colchester area. The Witham & District Co-operative party supported the submission of Stanway Parish Council.

76 The HNECA proposal was for Stanway to be linked to Marks Tey, and for a division to cover the southern edge of the City Council area, from Tiptree to East Mersea and Fingringhoe. Evidence was provided of links between coastal and river communities in the south, as well as a lack of any public transport links between Stanway and West Mersea. Conversely, the transport links between Stanway and Marks Tey, via Copford, were described as 'very good'.

77 We considered the revised proposals carefully and are persuaded to amend our draft recommendations. We are modifying the HNECA proposals in one respect – it was proposed to place Layer Breton parish in Stanway & Marks Tey division, but we have decided to place this parish in the Mersea and Tiptree division to the south, in order that our division pattern better reflects transport and communication links in the area.

78 Our final recommendations in this area are for Stanway & Marks Tey and Mersea & Tiptree divisions. Both are forecast to have good electoral equality, with variances of -1% and 9% respectively, by 2029.

Epping Forest



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Chigwell & Buckhurst Hill East	1	10%
Epping & Theydon Bois	1	-2%
Loughton North	1	1%
Loughton South & Buckhurst Hill West	1	-5%
North Weald & Nazeing	1	-9%
Ongar & Rural	1	-10%
Waltham Abbey	1	-3%

Chigwell & Buckhurst Hill East, Loughton North, and Loughton South & Buckhurst Hill West

79 We received mixed views on our draft recommendations for these divisions. The Council, Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups, the Epping Forest Conservative Association, and Cllrs S. Robinson, M. Vance, L. Scott, C. Whitbread and J. Whitehouse opposed our draft recommendations. They argued in favour of broadly retaining the existing divisions in this area, which link a section of eastern Loughton to Chigwell. They argued that Buckhurst Hill being split between divisions

would not reflect the community identity of this area, and that our proposed boundary along the railway line was not a clear dividing line.

80 In contrast, our draft recommendations were supported by a number of local residents, as well as the Loughton Residents' Association, and Cllrs C. Pond, S. Murray, R. Brookes, H. Kaufmann, and G. Wiskin. They argued that Loughton Broadway had little community identity with Chigwell, and that the draft recommendations offered the best available balance of the statutory criteria.

81 We have considered all the submissions received for this area carefully, and we visited this area on our visit to Essex. It is necessary for Chigwell to be paired with a neighbouring area in order to achieve good electoral equality so, given the geography and its position at the edge of the district, the options are essentially limited to Buckhurst Hill or a portion of Loughton. Some of the objections to our draft recommendations noted that the journey from Buckhurst Hill to Chigwell involves crossing the M25 and the River Roding – while we acknowledge this, we note that the same is true of the journey between Chigwell and Loughton Broadway.

82 Several submissions commented that, while clear on a map, the railway line through Buckhurst Hill does not offer a particularly strong boundary in practice. On our tour of Essex, we agreed with this observation, but also considered that the proposed boundary in the north of Loughton is neither strong nor clear – roads such as Westall Road, Burney Drive, and Castell Road appear to be surrounded by a single community rather than offering a clear divide.

83 We consider this decision to be particularly finely balanced. We have carefully considered the evidence received and have decided not to amend our draft recommendations. Accommodating both the expressed views on community identities and achieving an effective balance of all our statutory criteria is not possible. We note that travel from Buckhurst Hill to Chigwell along the B170 Roding Lane is a shorter journey than the one to Loughton Broadway, and that retaining our draft recommendations allows an extra district ward to be coterminous with divisions, providing for more effective and convenient local government.

84 Several submissions commented on the name of the division covering both Buckhurst Hill and Loughton, suggesting that, as the majority of electors in this division would be in Loughton parish, this name should appear first. While we are persuaded to alter our draft recommendations for this division name, given the broad local support for such a change, we do not consider as a general rule that appearing first in any compound name of a ward or division necessarily implies precedence, or that the first named settlement should always be the largest within an electoral area. Our division names for a given area will always be based on the evidence we receive for that specific area.

Epping & Theydon Bois, North Weald & Nazeing, Ongar & Rural, and Waltham Abbey


85 The Council proposed changes to our draft recommendations, including splitting Nazeing and North Weald Bassett parishes between divisions, and placing Matching and Sheering parishes in a division wrapping around the southern edge of Harlow. As well as creating a division which would be challenging to represent effectively, this would also split several additional district wards between divisions. Limited evidence of community identity was provided, and we have not adopted this proposal as part of our final recommendations.

86 Cllr C. Whitbread provided some evidence of school and transport links between the Thornwood Common area and Epping. However, in isolation, moving this area out of North Weald & Nazeing division would leave this division with a -15% electoral variance. We are not persuaded that sufficient evidence was provided to justify such a variance in this area and have therefore not adopted this proposal as part of our final recommendations.

87 Several submissions welcomed the continuation of the link between Coopersale and Epping, rather than placing Coopersale into Ongar & Rural division. Epping Forest Conservative Association expressed concerns about the size of Ongar & Rural division, while this division was supported by Cllrs J. McIvor and J Whitehouse. Cllr McIvor noted that the rural parishes across the division were likely to share similar issues.

88 We acknowledge that Ongar & Rural division is geographically large, although not significantly more so than other rural divisions across Essex. We considered reducing the size of this division by moving Stapleford Abbots parish into Chigwell & Buckhurst East division, but in the absence of community identity evidence to support this move, we concluded that leaving the draft recommendations in place provided the best available balance of our statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

Harlow



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Harlow Common & Church Langley	1	4%
Harlow Netteswell	1	3%
Harlow Parndon & Toddbrook	1	-8%
Harlow South West	1	-3%
Old Harlow	1	-7%

Harlow Common & Church Langley, Harlow Netteswell, Harlow Parndon & Toddbrook, Harlow South West, and Old Harlow


89 Our draft recommendations for Harlow were supported by Essex County Council, the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups, and Harlow Constituency Labour Party.

90 Harlow District Council proposed several changes to the draft recommendations, based on a desire for divisions to align with existing polling districts. Some of the changes proposed were relatively minor, but in one instance,

the changes proposed would remove roughly 600 electors from Harlow Parndon & Toddbrook division, leaving this division with a -12% variance. In any event, a desire to reflect existing polling district boundaries, which exist for the purpose of administering elections, is not a matter we consider as part of an electoral review.

91 We are not persuaded to alter our draft recommendations in Harlow and confirm them as final.

Maldon



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Burnham & Southminster	1	-10%
Maldon Rural North	1	-10%
Maldon Rural South	1	-9%
Maldon Town & Heybridge	1	-5%

Burnham & Southminster and Maldon Rural South

92 Our draft recommendations for these divisions were supported by Essex County Council, and the Liberal Democrat and Conservative groups. We received no other proposals for this area and confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Maldon Rural North and Maldon Town & Heybridge


93 The key question for these divisions was which Heybridge ward should be added to the wards of Maldon North, Maldon South and Maldon West to comprise an urban-based division. In our draft recommendations, we proposed that Heybridge East be added to the Maldon wards, and this was supported by the Council and

Conservative Group. Our draft recommendations did outline the potential for a two-councillor division, allowing Maldon and Heybridge to be within a single division, but this did not attract any support.

94 Cllr J. Driver renewed his suggestion from our initial consultation that Heybridge West, rather than Heybridge East, should be added to Maldon Town & Heybridge division. Cllr Driver, whose proposal was supported by the Liberal Democrat Group, noted the different nature of the ward in question, and that the fishing lakes straddling the boundary between Heybridge East and Great Totham wards were a key shared resource for both communities.

95 We visited this area on our tour of Essex. While we still consider that the decision is finely balanced, we are persuaded to alter our draft recommendations, and place Heybridge West ward within Maldon Town & Heybridge division, with Heybridge East being placed in Maldon Rural North division. We consider that the housing and retail facilities of Heybridge West share more in common with an urban division than those in Heybridge East, while continuing to note that, were it not for the constraints of electoral equality, we would prefer to keep all of Heybridge together in a single division.

Rochford




Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Rayleigh South	1	-11%
Rayleigh West	1	-12%
Rochford East	1	-9%
Rochford North	1	-4%
Rochford South	1	-5%

Rayleigh South, Rayleigh West, Rochford East, Rochford North, and Rochford South

96 Other than the submissions from Essex County Council, and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups, we received no comments on our proposed divisions in Rochford. All of the submissions received supported our draft recommendations, and we confirm these as final.

Tendring



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Brightlingsea	1	0%
Clacton North	1	8%
Clacton South	1	12%
Clacton West & St Osyth	1	10%
Frinton & Walton	1	-7%
Harwich	1	-2%
Tendring Rural East	1	-8%
Tendring Rural West	1	-6%

Brightlingsea and Clacton West & St Osyth

97 We received varying views on our draft recommendations in the south-west of Tendring. Essex County Council and the Liberal Democrat Group supported our draft recommendations, which placed a division boundary along Brightlingsea Creek, with St Osyth parish placed in our proposed Clacton West division.

98 An alternative proposal, supported by the Conservative Group, Cllr P. Honeywood and Cllr A. Goggin, was received from Harwich & North Essex Conservative Association (HNECA), with the support of Tendring Conservative Group. This placed the majority of St Osyth parish in a division with Brightlingsea, with the Association citing shared links around schooling and leisure facilities, (particularly between Point Clear, directly across the creek from Brightlingsea and Brightlingsea itself) in support of its proposal.

99 In order to achieve good electoral equality, the HNECA proposal placed a small portion of St Osyth parish north of St John's Road into a revised Clacton West/ Clacton Coastal division. This would split St Osyth district ward, reducing the level of coterminosity.

100 The HNECA proposed redrawing the divisions covering Clacton, in order to allow for the removal of most of St Osyth parish. While the proposed divisions offered good electoral equality, the proposed Clacton Central division extended from Rush Green to Holland-on-Sea, offering limited connectivity and joining areas with no obvious community identity. The HNECA noted that its proposal followed polling district boundaries whereas the draft recommendations did not – however, we do not consider that polling districts necessarily offer a good reflection of community identity, as they exist for the purpose of electoral administration.

101 We visited Brightlingsea on our tour of Essex, and viewed the location of the ferry links which were suggested as a key transport link in the HNECA submission. We noted that the ferry cannot take vehicles and operates only from April–September. We consider that, while there are shared interests between Point Clear and Brightlingsea, a seasonal and limited ferry service may not form a key link to allow accessibility within the proposed division. We are therefore not persuaded to alter our proposed boundaries and confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

102 Additionally, we could not identify a division pattern that places St Osyth in a different division and provides for an effective balance of our statutory criteria. Furthermore, it should be noted that it is not unusual for separate but neighbouring communities to be within a single division. However, we do consider it would be appropriate to add the name of the parish to that of Clacton West division. We are therefore amending the name of Clacton West division to Clacton West & St Osyth as part of our final recommendations.

Clacton North, Clacton South, Frinton & Walton, Harwich, Tendring Rural East, and Tendring Rural West

103 Other than the changes proposed for divisions within Clacton discussed above, we received no proposals for changes to these divisions. We received support from Essex County Council, and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups for the draft recommendations outside of Clacton, and we confirm these draft recommendations as final.

Uttlesford



Division name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Dunmow	1	0%
Saffron Walden	1	5%
Stansted	1	1%
Takeley	1	-6%
Thaxted	1	-5%

104 Uttlesford is allocated five councillors under a council size of 78. The District Council provided a submission broadly welcoming our draft recommendations. Saffron Walden Town Council provided a submission in favour of a minor amendment to our draft recommendations to reflect recently revised parish boundaries.

Dunmow and Takeley

105 Our draft recommendations for these divisions were supported by Essex Council, and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat groups. We received no proposals for changes to these divisions and confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Saffron Walden, Stansted, and Thaxted

106 Our draft recommendations for these division boundaries were supported by Essex County Council, the Conservative Group, and Cllr S. Barker. These submissions, and others, suggested reverting to the name 'Saffron Walden' for the division covering the town, and we have adopted this change as part of our final recommendations.

107 We received alternative proposals from the Liberal Democrat Group, which focused on the parishes of Henham and Elsenham. These proposals were supported by Stansted Mountfitchet, Henham and Elsenham parish councils, and a separate submission from the Uttlesford Liberal Democrats. Exact details of the proposals varied between the submissions, but all proposed adding Henham and Elsenham parishes to Stansted division, with varying proposals to move parishes into Thaxted division to compensate.

108 The Liberal Democrats, and parish councils, provided evidence of shared community interests between Elsenham and Henham, and Stansted Mountfitchet. These included school links, and issues of transport, particularly at the junction of Grove Hill and Lower Street in Stansted Mountfitchet.

109 We carefully considered all the submissions for this area and visited it on our tour of Essex. We consider that the junction of Grove Hill and Lower Street, which includes a single-track stretch of road, is undoubtedly a barrier to effective and easy movement – we also note that, under any arrangement of divisions, this area would be well within Stansted Mountfitchet parish, and therefore the responsibility of a single county councillor rather than being on a boundary where responsibility could be split.

110 Moving Henham and Elsenham into Stansted division without compensating for this change would result in electoral variances for Stansted and Thaxted divisions of 27% and -34%, respectively. Various proposals were received for which parishes could be moved in order to address these variances. While the details varied, the principle was consistently to move the northern parishes, which we proposed be located in our draft Stansted division, into an alternative division, whether that be Saffron Walden or Thaxted.

111 Given that our proposed Saffron Walden division is supported by evidence and attracted broad support, we are reluctant to make significant changes to it. The Liberal Democrats in particular welcomed Wendens Ambo parish being placed in Saffron Walden division, meaning that this division can absorb relatively few other areas and maintain good electoral equality. Various proposals were considered, including placing all of Newport district ward into Thaxted division, and a

‘wraparound division’ with all parishes as far as Chrishall and Langley added to Thaxted division.

112 We have considered all the options in this area carefully. Although we have recommended relatively high electoral variances in several other areas of the county, we are reluctant to do so when a proposal with good electoral equality, and backed up with a measure of support and evidence, is available. We have therefore decided not to extend Saffron Walden division to include parishes such as Langley and Chrishall. Subject to a minor change to follow newly revised parish boundaries between Saffron Walden and Swards End parishes, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this division as final.

113 While we note the evidence that Elsenham and Henham should be placed in a division with Stansted Mountfitchet, we cannot make this decision in isolation – we are required to propose a pattern of divisions across Uttlesford that, in our judgment, most effectively balances our statutory criteria. While we acknowledge that areas such as Chrishall and Elmdon may have little in the way of community identities with Stansted Mountfitchet, we have no evidence that their links to Thaxted, or the remainder of Thaxted division, are any stronger. Placing these areas in a ‘wraparound’ division that stretches across the entire width of the district would not, in our view, provide for effective and convenient local government. Such a division would be the largest by geographical area in Essex by a considerable margin, and travelling around and representing such a division effectively would be difficult for the member concerned.

114 Other than the minor amendment to the boundary between Saffron Walden and Thaxted divisions to follow revised parish boundaries, we are not persuaded to amend our draft recommendations for Stansted and Thaxted divisions, and we confirm them as final.

Conclusions

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

Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2022	2029
Number of councillors	78	78
Number of electoral divisions	78	78
Average number of electors per councillor	14,319	15,848
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	19	7
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	2	0

Final recommendations

Essex County Council should be made up of 78 councillors representing 78 single-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 the Essex County Council. You can also view our draft recommendations for Essex on our interactive maps at www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/essex

Parish electoral arrangements

116 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.

117 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, the relevant district and borough councils have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

118 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 Billericay, Chelmsford Garden, Epping Upland, Ramsey & Parkeston, Rayleigh, Rochford, and Wickford parishes.

119 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Billericay parish.

Final recommendations

Billericay Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Billericay Central	3
Billericay East	6
Billericay South West	3
Billericay West	8

120 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Chelmsford Garden parish.

Final recommendations

Chelmsford Garden Community Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing five wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Central	2
East	1
North	1
South	6
South West	3

121 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Epping Upland parish.

Final recommendations

Epping Upland Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Epping Green	6
Pond Field	1

122 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Ramsey & Parkeston parish.

Final recommendations

Ramsey & Parkeston Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Hewitt Road	2
Parkeston	4
Ramsey	5

123 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Rayleigh parish.

Final recommendations

Rayleigh Town Council should comprise 23 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Grange	5
King Georges	2
Lodge	4
Sweyne Park	3
Trinity	5
Victoria	1
Wheatley	2
Whitehouse	1

124 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Rochford parish.

Final recommendations

Rochford Parish Council should comprise 17 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
King Edmund	6
South	4
South East	5
Waterman	2

125 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Wickford parish.

Final recommendations

Wickford Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Wickford Castledon	6
Wickford Central	3
Wickford North	7
Wickford Park	4

What happens next?

126 We have now completed our review of Essex County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2025.

Equalities

127 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

Final recommendations for Essex 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 %
BASILDON								
1	Billericay North	1	16,061	16,061	12%	17,183	17,183	8%
2	Burstead	1	16,349	16,349	14%	17,560	17,560	11%
3	Castledon & Crouch	1	14,743	14,743	3%	15,766	15,766	-1%
4	Gloucester Park	1	14,478	14,478	1%	17,206	17,206	9%
5	Laindon Town	1	15,253	15,253	7%	16,813	16,813	6%
6	Pitsea	1	15,427	15,427	8%	16,488	16,488	4%
7	Vange	1	15,581	15,581	9%	17,040	17,040	8%
8	Westley Heights	1	15,061	15,061	5%	16,565	16,565	5%
9	Wickford East & Bowers Gifford	1	15,636	15,636	9%	16,926	16,926	7%

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 %
BRAINTREE								
10	Bocking	1	14,720	14,720	3%	16,675	16,675	5%
11	Braintree Eastern	1	12,542	12,542	-12%	14,510	14,510	-8%
12	Braintree Town	1	15,025	15,025	5%	15,645	15,645	-1%
13	Halstead	1	16,122	16,122	13%	16,989	16,989	7%
14	Hedingham	1	14,282	14,282	0%	14,896	14,896	-6%
15	Three Fields & Great Notley	1	14,660	14,660	2%	15,386	15,386	-3%
16	Witham Town	1	14,862	14,862	4%	16,192	16,192	2%
17	Witham West & Rural	1	12,980	12,980	-9%	15,879	15,879	0%
BRENTWOOD								
18	Brentwood Hutton	1	15,300	15,300	7%	17,192	17,192	8%
19	Brentwood North	1	14,449	14,449	1%	17,064	17,064	8%
20	Brentwood Rural	1	14,463	14,463	1%	15,916	15,916	0%
21	Brentwood South	1	15,466	15,466	8%	17,731	17,731	12%

	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 %
CASTLE POINT								
22	Canvey Island East	1	15,060	15,060	5%	15,840	15,840	0%
23	Canvey Island West	1	14,123	14,123	-1%	14,681	14,681	-7%
24	Hadleigh	1	13,026	13,026	-9%	13,664	13,664	-14%
25	South Benfleet	1	13,427	13,427	-6%	14,063	14,063	-11%
26	Thundersley	1	13,685	13,685	-4%	14,406	14,406	-9%
CHELMSFORD								
27	Broomfield & Writtle	1	15,718	15,718	10%	16,926	16,926	7%
28	Chelmer	1	14,934	14,934	4%	17,290	17,290	9%
29	Chelmsford Central	1	13,540	13,540	-5%	15,158	15,158	-4%
30	Chelmsford North	1	14,922	14,922	4%	15,972	15,972	1%
31	Chelmsford Springfield	1	14,941	14,941	4%	16,359	16,359	3%
32	Chelmsford West	1	13,087	13,087	-9%	14,364	14,364	-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 %
33	Danbury & The Hanningfields	1	15,256	15,256	7%	16,856	16,856	6%
34	Great Baddow & Galleywood	1	15,184	15,184	6%	16,649	16,649	5%
35	Woodham Ferrers	1	14,139	14,139	-1%	15,215	15,215	-4%
COLCHESTER								
36	Colchester Abbey	1	15,961	15,961	11%	17,158	17,158	8%
37	Colchester Lexden	1	14,317	14,317	0%	15,464	15,464	-2%
38	Colchester Maypole	1	15,122	15,122	6%	16,585	16,585	5%
39	Colchester North	1	15,275	15,275	7%	17,114	17,114	8%
40	Colchester St Johns	1	15,335	15,335	7%	16,659	16,659	5%
41	Constable	1	14,903	14,903	4%	16,481	16,481	4%
42	Mersea & Tiptree	1	15,927	15,927	11%	17,312	17,312	9%
43	Stanway & Marks Tey	1	14,066	14,066	-2%	15,626	15,626	-1%

	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 %
44	Wivenhoe St Andrew	1	15,331	15,331	7%	17,458	17,458	10%
EPPING FOREST								
45	Chigwell & Buckhurst Hill East	1	16,129	16,129	13%	17,452	17,452	10%
46	Epping & Theydon Bois	1	14,516	14,516	1%	15,520	15,520	-2%
47	Loughton North	1	14,971	14,971	5%	16,041	16,041	1%
48	Loughton South & Buckhurst Hill West	1	13,916	13,916	-3%	15,126	15,126	-5%
49	North Weald & Nazeing	1	11,640	11,640	-19%	14,492	14,492	-9%
50	Ongar & Rural	1	13,016	13,016	-9%	14,241	14,241	-10%
51	Waltham Abbey	1	14,120	14,120	-1%	15,390	15,390	-3%
HARLOW								
52	Harlow Common & Church Langley	1	15,354	15,354	7%	16,545	16,545	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 %
53	Harlow Netteswell	1	14,356	14,356	0%	16,335	16,335	3%
54	Harlow Parndon & Toddbrook	1	11,212	11,212	-22%	14,571	14,571	-8%
55	Harlow South West	1	14,419	14,419	1%	15,413	15,413	-3%
56	Old Harlow	1	8,356	8,356	-42%	14,775	14,775	-7%
MALDON								
57	Burnham & Southminster	1	12,083	12,083	-16%	14,258	14,258	-10%
58	Maldon Rural North	1	12,809	12,809	-11%	14,332	14,332	-10%
59	Maldon Rural South	1	12,669	12,669	-12%	14,373	14,373	-9%
60	Maldon Town & Heybridge	1	13,143	13,143	-8%	15,060	15,060	-5%
ROCHFORD								
61	Rayleigh South	1	13,395	13,395	-6%	14,128	14,128	-11%
62	Rayleigh West	1	12,799	12,799	-11%	13,999	13,999	-12%
63	Rochford East	1	13,581	13,581	-5%	14,425	14,425	-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 %
64	Rochford North	1	14,312	14,312	0%	15,208	15,208	-4%
65	Rochford South	1	13,520	13,520	-6%	15,118	15,118	-5%
TENDRING								
66	Brightlingsea	1	13,868	13,868	-3%	15,859	15,859	0%
67	Clacton North	1	16,052	16,052	12%	17,090	17,090	8%
68	Clacton South	1	16,471	16,471	15%	17,735	17,735	12%
69	Clacton West & St Osyth	1	15,982	15,982	12%	17,456	17,456	10%
70	Frinton & Walton	1	13,672	13,672	-5%	14,771	14,771	-7%
71	Harwich	1	14,539	14,539	2%	15,598	15,598	-2%
72	Tendring Rural East	1	12,931	12,931	-10%	14,594	14,594	-8%
73	Tendring Rural West	1	12,787	12,787	-11%	14,825	14,825	-6%
UTTLESFORD								
74	Dunmow	1	14,392	14,392	1%	15,786	15,786	0%
75	Saffron Walden	1	15,331	15,331	7%	16,708	16,708	5%


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 %
76 Stansted	1	14,787	14,787	3%	16,078	16,078	1%
77 Takeley	1	11,676	11,676	-18%	14,831	14,831	-6%
78 Thaxted	1	13,302	13,302	-7%	15,064	15,064	-5%
Totals	78	1,116,845	–	–	1,236,124	–	–
Averages	–	–	14,319	–	–	15,848	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Essex 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	Billericay North
2	Burstead
3	Castledon & Crouch
4	Gloucester Park
5	Laindon Town
6	Pitsea
7	Vange
8	Westley Heights
9	Wickford East & Bowers Gifford
10	Bocking
11	Braintree Eastern
12	Braintree Town
13	Halstead
14	Hedingham
15	Three Fields & Great Notley
16	Witham Town
17	Witham West & Rural

18	Brentwood Hutton
19	Brentwood North
20	Brentwood Rural
21	Brentwood South
22	Canvey Island East
23	Canvey Island West
24	Hadleigh
25	South Benfleet
26	Thundersley
27	Broomfield & Writtle
28	Chelmer
29	Chelmsford Central
30	Chelmsford North
31	Chelmsford Springfield
32	Chelmsford West
33	Danbury & The Hanningfields
34	Great Baddow & Galleywood
35	Woodham Ferrers
36	Colchester Abbey
37	Colchester Lexden
38	Colchester Maypole
39	Colchester North
40	Colchester St Johns
41	Constable
42	Mersea & Tiptree
43	Stanway & Marks Tey
44	Wivenhoe St Andrew
45	Chigwell & Buckhurst Hill East
46	Epping & Theydon Bois
47	Loughton North
48	Loughton South & Buckhurst Hill West
49	North Weald & Nazeing
50	Ongar & Rural
51	Waltham Abbey
52	Harlow Common & Church Langley
53	Harlow Netteswell
54	Harlow Parndon & Toddbrook
55	Harlow South West
56	Old Harlow
57	Burnham & Southminster
58	Maldon Rural North
59	Maldon Rural South

60	Maldon Town & Heybridge
61	Rayleigh South
62	Rayleigh West
63	Rochford East
64	Rochford North
65	Rochford South
66	Brightlingsea
67	Clacton North
68	Clacton South
69	Clacton West & St Osyth
70	Frinton & Walton
71	Harwich
72	Tendring Rural East
73	Tendring Rural West
74	Dunmow
75	Saffron Walden
76	Stansted
77	Takeley
78	Thaxted

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/essex

Appendix C

Submissions received

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

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

Local Authorities

- Basildon Borough Council
- Chelmsford City Council
- Essex County Council
- Harlow District Council
- Uttlesford District Council

Political Groups

- Braintree & Bocking Branch Labour Party
- Braintree & Witham Labour Parties
- Braintree District Labour Party
- Brentwood & Ongar Liberal Democrats
- Brentwood Council Labour Group
- Canvey Residents' Alliance
- Chelmsford Constituency Conservative Association
- Chelmsford Labour Party
- Epping Forest Conservative Association
- Essex County Council Conservative Group
- Essex County Council Liberal Democrats
- Harlow Constituency Labour Party
- Harwich & North Essex Conservative Association (2 submissions)
- Independent Loughton Residents' Association
- Tendring Conservative Group
- Uttlesford Liberal Democrats
- Witham & Braintree Green Party
- Witham & District Co-operative Party
- Witham Branch Labour Party
- Witham Constituency Labour Party

Councillors

- Councillor S. Barker (Essex County Council)
- Councillor P. Barlow (Witham Town Council)
- Councillor R. Brookes (Loughton Town Council)

- Councillor M. Buckley (Essex County Council)
- Councillor L. Burrows (Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor G. Butland (Braintree District Council)
- Councillor C. Calver (Sible Hedingham Parish Council)
- Councillor M. Cunningham (Braintree District Council)
- Councillor T. Cunningham (Essex County Council)
- Councillor C. Davidson (Chelmsford City Council)
- Councillor J. Driver (Maldon District Council)
- Councillor M. Durham (Essex County Council)
- Councillor L. Fryerns (Essex County Council)
- Councillor A. Goggin (Essex County Council, Tendring District Council & Brightlingsea Town Council)
- Councillor L. Headley (Witham Town Council)
- Councillor P. Heath (Braintree District Council)
- Councillor P. Honeywood (Essex County Council & Tendring District Council)
- Councillor H. Kaufman (Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor D. Kendall (Brentwood Borough Council)
- Councillor J. Law (Colchester City Council)
- Councillor D. Louis (Essex County Council)
- Councillor J. Martin (Braintree District Council)
- Councillor J. McIvor (Essex County Council & Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor A. McQuiggan (Essex County Council)
- Councillor S. Murray (Loughton Town Council)
- Councillor R. Playle (Essex County Council)
- Councillor C. Pond (Essex County Council & Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor R. Powers (Stisted Parish Council)
- Councillor F. Preston (Halsted Town Council)
- Councillor R. Ramage (Braintree District Council & Witham Town Council)
- Councillor S. Robinson (Chelmsford City Council)
- Councillor A. Schrader (Basildon Borough Council)
- Councillor L. Scordis (Essex County Council & Colchester City Council)
- Councillor L. Scott (Essex County Council)
- Councillor L. Skingsley (Chigwell Parish Council)
- Councillor K. Smith (Essex County Council & Basildon Borough Council)
- Councillor C. Tron (Chelmsford Garden Community Council)
- Councillor M. Vance (Essex County Council & Buckhurst Hill Parish Council)
- Councillor R. van Dulken (Braintree District Council)

- Councillor C. Whitbread (Essex County Council & Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor J. Whitehouse (Epping Forest District Council)
- Councillor T. Williams (Braintree District Council)
- Councillor G. Wiskin (Loughton Town Council)

Local Organisations

- Stisted Village Hall

Parish and Town Councils

- Canvey Island Town Council
- Chelmsford Garden Community Council
- Elsenham Parish Council
- Feering Parish Council
- Galleywood Parish Council
- Henham Parish Council
- Saffron Walden Town Council
- St Osyth Parish Council
- Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council
- Stanway Parish Council
- West Horndon Parish Council

Local Residents

- 29 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

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

www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Twitter: @LGBCE