

October 2021

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 2021

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 Rushcliffe?	2
Our proposals for Rushcliffe	2
How will the recommendations affect you?	2
Have your say	3
Review timetable	3
Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	4
Number of councillors	5
Ward boundaries consultation	5
Draft recommendations	5
South Western Rushcliffe	7
South Eastern Rushcliffe	12
North Eastern Rushcliffe	14
Northern and Central Rushcliffe	17
North Eastern West Bridgford	19
South Western West Bridgford	21
Conclusions	23
Summary of electoral arrangements	23
Parish electoral arrangements	24
Have your say	25
Equalities	29
Appendices	31
Appendix A	31
Draft recommendations for Rushcliffe	31
Appendix B	33
Outline map	33
Appendix C	35
Submissions received	35
Appendix D	36

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) | • Amanda Nobbs OBE |
| • Andrew Scallan CBE
(Deputy Chair) | • Steve Robinson |
| • Susan Johnson OBE | • Jolyon Jackson CBE
(Chief Executive) |
| • Peter Maddison QPM | |

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 Rushcliffe?

7 We are conducting a review of Rushcliffe Council ('the Council') as the value of each vote in borough council elections varies depending on where you live in Rushcliffe. Some councillors currently represent many more or fewer electors than others. This is 'electoral inequality'. Our aim is to create 'electoral equality', where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

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

- The wards in Rushcliffe 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 borough.

Our proposals for Rushcliffe

9 Rushcliffe should be represented by 44 councillors, the same number as there are now.

10 Rushcliffe should have 21 wards, four fewer than there are now.

11 The boundaries of most wards should change; three 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 ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough 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.

Have your say

14 We will consult on the draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 5 October 2021 to 13 December 2021. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to comment on these proposed wards 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 wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

16 You have until 13 December 2021 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 25 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 Rushcliffe. We then held a period of consultation with the public on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

18 The review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
20 April 2021	Number of councillors decided
11 May 2021	Start of consultation seeking views on new wards
19 July 2021	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
5 October 2021	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
13 December 2021	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
1 March 2022	Publication of final recommendations

Analysis and draft recommendations

19 Legislation² states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors³ 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 wards.

20 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards 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.

	2020	2027
Electorate of Rushcliffe	90,558	107,013
Number of councillors	44	44
Average number of electors per councillor	2,058	2,432

22 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. All but one of our proposed wards for Rushcliffe are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2027.

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 2027, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2022. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 18% by 2027.

25 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.

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

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Number of councillors

26 Rushcliffe Council currently has 44 councillors. We have looked at evidence provided by the Council and have concluded that keeping this number the same will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

27 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 44 councillors, for example, 44 one-councillor wards, 22 two-councillor wards, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

28 We received no submissions specifically about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. We therefore based our draft recommendations on a 44-councillor council.

Ward boundaries consultation

29 We received 35 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

30 We did not receive any borough-wide schemes which we typically would expect to be submitted from either the Council or any of the groups on the Council.

31 Given the travel restrictions, and the social distancing, arising from the Covid-19 pandemic, there was a detailed ‘virtual’ tour of Rushcliffe. This helped to clarify issues raised in submissions and assisted in the construction of the draft recommendations.

Draft recommendations

32 Our draft recommendations are for seven three-councillor wards, nine two-councillor wards and five one-councillor wards. In the absence of a borough-wide scheme, these wards are based on community evidence with regard to specific areas where this was received, and electoral equality where no evidence with regard to the other two statutory criteria was received. We consider that our draft recommendations will generally provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

33 The tables and maps on pages 7–22 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Rushcliffe. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

- Equality of representation.


⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

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

34 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table starting on page 31 and on the large map accompanying this report.

35 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

South Western Rushcliffe



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Barton in Fabis	1	-6%
Bunny	1	-4%
Leake	3	4%
Ruddington	3	-3%
Soar Valley	2	-14%

Barton in Fabis and Soar Valley

36 Cllr Rex Walker noted that the key point when considering warding arrangements for Gotham and surrounding parishes was the large development at Fairham, in Barton in Fabis parish, which is projected to include 1,880 electors by 2027. Cllr Walker noted that this development would be essentially suburban in character, as opposed to the rural nature of the remaining parishes in this area.

37 Cllr Walker noted that the Fairham development would make the existing Gotham ward unviable as either a single-member ward (his preference) or a two-member ward. He suggested that, once the Fairham development is complete, we could consider altering ward boundaries without a full-scale electoral review, in order to allow Fairham to be the hub of its own ward.

38 A resident suggested that a two-councillor ward be created comprising Barton in Fabis, Thrumpton, Gotham, Kingston on Soar, Ratcliffe on Soar, and Sutton Bonnington parishes. However, this proposed ward would have 22% more electors than average – well beyond what we consider to be acceptable electoral equality.

39 Although our focus is on the number of electors in 2027, there is also a requirement for a viable election to be conducted on these boundaries in 2023, so we are not persuaded to propose a ward consisting solely of the Fairham development. Such a ward would also contain roughly 23% fewer electors per councillor than average by 2027. However, we are persuaded of the need to recognise the Fairham development, and ensure that this is reflected in the warding patterns. We are therefore proposing a single-member ward covering the entirety of Barton in Fabis parish, offering both good electoral equality by 2027 (6% fewer electors per councillor than average), and a viable number of electors to conduct an election before this date.

40 With regard to the suggestion of altering ward boundaries between reviews to reflect large-scale developments, the Council has the ability to conduct Community Governance Reviews, which can alter parish boundaries, and create and abolish parishes. The Council can also request us to make a Related Alteration so that ward boundaries align with altered parish boundaries.

41 We propose to place the remaining parishes in this area, from Gotham and Thrumpton around the edge of the borough to Stanford on Soar, into a new Soar Valley ward. This was not proposed to us, but remains the only practical alternative for these parishes, mostly linked by the River Soar. We received no community evidence in this area, with the exception of that relating to Barton in Fabis, discussed above.

42 Our proposed Soar Valley ward does not offer good electoral equality, with 14% fewer electors per councillor than average. We considered adding parishes to this ward in order to improve this variance. However, as discussed below (paragraphs 49–50), we received compelling evidence as to the community links between West Leake and East Leake parishes, meaning that it would not reflect community identity to split them. Adding West Leake to Soar Valley ward would result in a variance of -12%. This is better than the -14% we are proposing, but still does not offer good electoral equality, and we have therefore not been persuaded to recommend this ward.

43 We also considered adding Rempstone parish to this ward, which would offer good electoral equality at a -7% variance. However, removing this parish from the proposed Bunny ward would not only break community links along Loughborough Road/Bunny Hill, but also require further knock-on changes to Keyworth & Wolds ward. We do not consider this offers the best balance of our statutory criteria.

44 We further considered dividing Soar Valley into two single-member wards, but this exacerbates the problem of poor electoral equality. For example, a ward comprising Stanford-on-Soar, Normanton-on-Soar, Sutton Bonnington and Kingston-on-Soar parishes would offer excellent equality, at 1% fewer electors than average. However, the remaining parishes in our proposed ward would then face very poor electoral equality, with 28% fewer electors than average. Based on the evidence received, and the distribution of electors, we consider that a two-member ward at -14% electoral variance is the best option, albeit an imperfect one, and we therefore propose it as a draft recommendation.

Bunny and Ruddington

45 We propose to retain the existing Ruddington ward, coterminous with the parish of the same name. This was requested by Ruddington Parish Council, although no evidence relating to our statutory criteria was provided.

46 Several residents wrote to us, commenting on recent and proposed developments around Ruddington, and expressing concern that this could alter the nature of the village as a separate settlement from West Bridgford, and the wider Nottingham urban area. We have taken this as evidence that Ruddington has a separate community identity from the neighbouring parishes.

47 We received evidence from two residents suggesting that the existing Bunny ward worked well, with one pointing to a lack of links with the relatively large village of East Leake, and the other noting that Bunny, Bradmore, Costock and Rempstone parishes related well to one another. Bradmore Parish Council noted that they would prefer to retain the existing Bunny ward.

48 We propose one addition to the existing Bunny ward, which is the addition of Plumtree parish in order to improve the electoral equality of Tollerton ward.


Leake

49 We received evidence from Cllrs Thomas, Shaw and Way, and East Leake Parish Council, outlining the strong community links that exist between East and West Leake. The councillors for the existing Leake ward noted that West Leake was affected by issues related to the larger East Leake parish, such as traffic, sewage works and the East Midlands Airport flightpath.

50 Given the relative paucity of evidence in other areas of Rushcliffe, we consider this evidence to be compelling, and have adopted the proposal to retain a Leake ward, combining East Leake and West Leake parishes.

51 The councillors also noted that there were links between Leake and Stanford-on-Soar parish, citing bus links and Stanford Hall Defence and National Rehabilitation Centre. However, we note that adding Stanford-on-Soar to Leake ward would worsen the electoral variance of both our proposed Leake and Soar Valley wards. We have therefore not been persuaded to adopt this proposal.

South Eastern Rushcliffe



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Keyworth & Wolds	3	10%
Neville & Langar	1	-2%

Keyworth & Wolds

52 One resident suggested that Keyworth parish could be best represented as three single-member wards, based on the existing polling districts in this area. While this option offered good electoral equality for some wards, little evidence was provided as to how this would offer a better reflection of community identity, or provide for effective & convenient local government. Further, this proposal did not offer any suggestions as to which ward Widmerpool or Willoughby on the Wolds parishes should be placed in; they cannot be added to either of the neighbouring wards while maintaining good electoral equality.

53 We have therefore not adopted this proposal, and propose to retain the existing three-member Keyworth & Wolds ward. If it is considered that community identity would be better reflected by a ward or wards more narrowly focussed on Keyworth

itself, we would welcome further proposals to this effect, particularly those which offer good electoral equality for Widmerpool and Willoughby on the Wolds parishes.


Nevile & Langar

54 We received evidence from Cllr Combellack, the current councillor for the existing ward. She provided evidence that the existing ward was as geographically large as is compatible with effective representation, and that it should not be enlarged.

55 Kinoulton Parish Council provided evidence of the relatively strong community links between it and neighbouring parishes, including sporting ties, schools and allotments serving multiple parishes. They requested that links between Kinoulton, Hickling, Upper Broughton and Owthorpe be maintained.

56 We have adopted both of these submissions, and propose to retain the existing Nevile & Langar ward. We note that this maintains the existing split of Langar cum Barnstone parish, and would welcome evidence as to whether this continues to reflect the community identity of this area.

North Eastern Rushcliffe



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Aslockton & Cropwell	2	10%
Bingham North	2	-6%
Bingham South	2	-2%
East Bridgford	2	7%

Aslockton & Cropwell

57 On our virtual tour, we considered that Aslockton and Whatton-in-the-Vale parishes were closely linked, forming essentially a single village that should not be split between different wards. With this in mind, and also our decision to not expand Nevile & Langar ward (paragraphs 54–56), this led us to place Elton-on-the-Hill,

Granby, Tithby and Wiverton Hall parishes and the northern section of Langar cum Barnstone parish in a ward with Aslockton and Whatton-in-the-Vale.

58 We received evidence from the Upper Saxondale Residents' Association, indicating that their community was currently split between wards, and between the parishes of Cropwell Butler and Radcliffe on Trent. This submission provided excellent evidence as to the nature of this community, and demonstrated in a compelling fashion how the residents of this area felt that they were not well served by the existing ward boundaries.

59 Any potential changes to parish boundaries are not a matter for this review, but we have adopted the submission of the Residents' Association, and propose to move this area into a ward with Cropwell Butler.

60 We considered keeping Cropwell and Aslockton wards as separate single-member wards. However, any potential Cropwell ward (comprising Cropwell Bishop and Cropwell Butler parishes, and Upper Saxondale) would be projected to have 14% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2027. We do not consider that this departure from electoral equality is justified, given the existence of a plausible alternative.

61 We propose to combine the Aslockton and Cropwell areas to create a single, two-member ward covering the area to the south of Bingham. This ward will have acceptable electoral equality (10% more electors than average), and is a predominantly rural-based ward, avoiding the issue of joining the urban area of Bingham with a large rural area.

Bingham North and Bingham South

62 The parish of Bingham in isolation, with 9,313 electors forecast by 2027, is entitled to four councillors (i.e. two two-member wards, or one three-member ward and a single-member ward). We considered both joining Bingham with parishes to the south, or retaining the existing east/west split, but instead propose to divide the town into North and South wards.

63 We received some evidence with regard to Bingham. One resident suggested a single ward covering all of Bingham – as a matter of policy we do not recommend wards of more than three members, as we believe that this does not promote democratic accountability. A resident suggested that Saxondale parish did not feel it was represented by councillors with a focus on the urban areas of Bingham.

64 Given the new developments to the north of Bingham town, on either side of Chapel Lane, the existing east/west split of Bingham is no longer viable because it would result in poor levels of electoral equality. We therefore propose a north/south split, with the southern section retaining the rural area outside of the built-up area of Bingham town but within the parish. We considered placing a boundary along the

A52 Grantham Road, but note that this would require the creation of a parish ward in the southern section of Bingham parish with very few electors. We do not consider that this would promote effective & convenient local government.

East Bridgford

65 This proposed ward covers 15 parishes mostly in the rural north-east of the borough. We received very little evidence of community identity in this area, with the exception of one resident who asserted that East Bridgford should not be placed in a ward with Bingham. Shelford Parish Council suggested that no changes should be made, without offering evidence of why or how the existing wards continued to meet our statutory criteria.

66 The existing East Bridgford ward is not forecast to retain good electoral equality, and therefore we are not proposing to use it as the basis of new wards. We have therefore created new proposals in this area, based on providing good electoral equality and our observations during our virtual tour of Rushcliffe.

67 The neighbouring parishes of East Bridgford, Newton and Shelford have more projected electors than can be accommodated within a single-member ward with good electoral equality, but too few for a two-councillor ward without adding additional parishes. Adding the remaining parishes in the north of the borough allows the creation of a two-member ward with acceptable electoral equality, at 7% more electors per councillor than average.

68 We considered dividing East Bridgford parish, with roughly 900 electors to go into a single-member ward with Newton and Shelford parishes, and the remainder to go into a rural-based single-member ward. This proposal would offer good electoral equality, but it would involve an arbitrary split of East Bridgford village. Our preference in such situations is to join together communities which may not have obvious ties, rather than split an established community between two wards.

Northern and Central Rushcliffe



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Cotgrave	3	0%
Radcliffe on Trent	3	2%
Tollerton	1	8%

Cotgrave and Tollerton

69 We received one submission regarding Tollerton ward, from a resident, suggesting a single-member ward consisting solely of Tollerton parish. Such a ward offers acceptable electoral equality, and we have adopted this proposal.

70 As discussed at paragraph 48, we propose that Plumtree parish should move into Bunny ward. The remaining parishes from the existing Tollerton ward, Clipston and Normanton on the Wolds, we propose to move into Cotgrave ward, giving this ward ideal electoral equality.


Radcliffe on Trent

71 A resident provided evidence that residents of Holme Pierrepont hamlet used facilities and schools within Radcliffe on Trent, and would therefore be best placed in a ward with this town, rather than Gamston or another West Bridgford-based ward. In contrast to this, we note the grouped status of Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council.

72 We consider that this judgment is particularly finely balanced, especially considering that either option offers good electoral equality. On balance, we are persuaded to place the geographic bulk of Holme Pierrepont parish into Gamston ward, as we do not consider that the evidence of community identity outweighs considerations of effective and convenient local government. We would be particularly interested in further evidence as to the strength of feeling from the relevant parish councils and residents of the area in question.

73 Given this decision, we propose to retain the existing Radcliffe on Trent ward, less the Upper Saxondale area discussed above (paragraphs 58–59).

North Eastern West Bridgford



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Abbey	3	-8%
Gamston	2	-1%
Trent Bridge	3	-8%

Abbey and Trent Bridge

74 We received one suggestion for these wards, from Cllr Jones, who made comments in passing alongside his primary suggestion for Musters ward. He suggested that Grange Park, Valley Road and Alford Road could move into Abbey ward. However, as discussed below, we have placed these roads in an expanded Gamston ward.

75 We considered retaining, as far as possible, the existing three wards in this area, including Lady Bay ward. However, on our virtual tour of Rushcliffe, we did not consider that the existing boundary running along Abbey Road and Abbey Circus, and dividing streets from Florence Road to Eltham Road, was a strong or clear

boundary. We consider that our proposed boundary, along Rectory Road and the Grantham Canal, is stronger and clearer.


76 We propose to retain the existing southern boundary of Abbey ward, with the exception of Leahurst Gardens, where we consider that a boundary along Leahurst Road is stronger and clearer, as well as improving the electoral equality of Abbey ward.

Gamston

77 Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council provided evidence that the existing Gamston North and Gamston South wards should merge into a single Gamston ward.

78 We have adopted this suggestion, as we consider that there is evidence of a community identity in the sections of Gamston inside and outside Gamston parish, linked by the Ambleside/Beckside spine road. In order to improve the electoral equality of this new ward, we also propose to include a section of the existing Edwalton ward, from Spinney Close north to Leahurst Road. We would be particularly interested in further information about whether this area shares a community identity with Gamston, or whether electors in this area feel there are stronger links to other parts of West Bridgford.

South Western West Bridgford



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2027
Compton Acres	2	-1%
Edwalton	2	-2%
Lutterell	1	6%
Musters	2	10%

Compton Acres, Lutterell and Musters

79 We received one submission from a resident, providing evidence that Chaworth Road shared greater community links to Musters, in terms of shops, transport links and educational facilities, than it did to Lutterell. We have adopted this suggestion, and propose to move this area, together with culs-de-sac to the west of Loughborough Road, into Musters ward.

80 Although the A60 Loughborough Road itself would be a strong and clear boundary, we do not consider that it would reflect the community identity of streets such as Northwold Avenue or Elm Tree Avenue to be placed into Compton Acres ward. We welcome further evidence as to where the community identity of these streets lies.

81 Moving the area around Chaworth Road out of Lutterell ward means that the ward is no longer viable as a two-member ward. We propose retaining the southern portion of the existing Lutterell ward as a single-member ward. We considered whether to merge this area with Compton Acres as a three-member ward, but on our virtual tour we considered that there is evidence of a separate community identity between those living east and west of Walcote Drive.

82 We would be particularly interested in further evidence as to the community identity of this area, and as to whether Lutterell is still an appropriate name for this smaller ward.

83 We propose to retain the majority of the existing Compton Acres ward, with a small extension to take in Collington Way and neighbouring streets. This allows the neighbouring wards of Musters and Lutterell to have good electoral equality.

Edwalton

84 One resident suggested that Edwalton ward should exclude the new developments (forecast to include roughly 2,000 electors by 2027) in the Melton Road area. No evidence was provided, other than considerations of electoral equality.

85 While the community identity of future developments is inevitably uncertain, we consider that it is likely that the new developments will look to Edwalton for services, at least initially. With the extension of Gamston ward to the south (discussed at paragraphs 77–78), the remainder of our proposed Edwalton ward can include the new developments and retain good electoral equality as a two-member ward.

Conclusions

86 The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality in Rushcliffe, referencing the 2020 and 2027 electorate figures against the proposed number of councillors and wards. 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

	Draft recommendations	
	2020	2027
Number of councillors	44	44
Number of electoral wards	21	21
Average number of electors per councillor	2,058	2,432
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	8	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	6	0

Draft recommendations

Rushcliffe should be made up of 44 councillors serving 21 wards representing seven single-councillor wards, nine two-councillor wards and five three-councillor wards. 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 wards for Rushcliffe.

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

Parish electoral arrangements

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

88 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, Rushcliffe Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

89 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 Bingham and Radcliffe on Trent.

90 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bingham parish.

Draft recommendations

Bingham Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Bingham Northeast	2
Bingham Northwest	5
Bingham Southeast	5
Bingham Southwest	2

91 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Radcliffe on Trent parish.

Draft recommendations

Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
Manvers	8
Trent	9
Upper Saxondale	1

Have your say

92 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 borough or just a part of it.

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

94 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps. You can find it at www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk

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

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

96 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Rushcliffe 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.

97 A good pattern of wards 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.

98 Electoral equality:

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

99 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?

100 Effective local government:

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

101 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.

102 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.

103 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.

104 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 Rushcliffe in 2023.

Equalities

105 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 Rushcliffe

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2027)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Abbey	3	6,260	2,087	1%	6,718	2,239	-8%
2	Aslockton & Cropwell	2	4,964	2,482	21%	5,342	2,679	10%
3	Barton in Fabis	1	225	225	-89%	2,276	2,276	-6%
4	Bingham North	2	3,098	1,549	-30%	4,568	2,179	-6%
5	Bingham South	2	4,430	2,215	12%	4,745	2,478	-2%
6	Bunny	1	2,218	2,218	8%	2,324	2,324	-4%
7	Compton Acres	2	4,468	2,234	7%	4,839	2,392	-1%
8	Cotgrave	3	6,520	2,173	6%	7,329	2,443	0%
9	East Bridgford	2	4,105	2,053	0%	5,227	2,614	7%
10	Edwalton	2	3,209	1,605	-22%	4,774	2,387	-2%
11	Gamston	2	4,598	2,299	8%	4,836	2,343	-1%
12	Keyworth & Wolds	3	6,569	2,190	6%	8,027	2,676	10%


Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2027)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Leake	3	6,473	2,158	5%	7,611	2,537	4%
14 Lutterell	1	2,466	2,466	22%	2,567	2,623	6%
15 Musters	2	5,153	2,577	25%	5,369	2,685	10%
16 Nevile & Langar	1	2,245	2,245	8%	2,386	2,371	-2%
17 Radcliffe on Trent	3	6,005	2,002	0%	7,471	2,541	2%
18 Ruddington	3	5,848	1,949	-5%	7,100	2,367	-3%
19 Soar Valley	2	3,727	1,864	-9%	4,169	2,085	-14%
20 Tollerton	1	1,550	1,550	-25%	2,636	2,636	8%
21 Trent Bridge	3	6,427	2,142	4%	6,699	2,233	-8%
Totals	44	90,558	–	–	107,013	–	–
Averages	–	–	2,058	–	–	2,432	–

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the borough. 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	Ward name
1	Abbey
2	Aslockton & Cropwell
3	Barton in Fabis
4	Bingham North
5	Bingham South
6	Bunny
7	Compton Acres
8	Cotgrave
9	East Bridgford
10	Edwalton
11	Gamston
12	Keyworth & Wolds
13	Leake

14	Lutterell
15	Musters
16	Nevile & Langar
17	Radcliffe on Trent
18	Ruddington
19	Soar Valley
20	Tollerton
21	Trent Bridge

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/current-reviews/east-midlands/rushcliffe

Appendix C

Submissions received

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

www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/rushcliffe

Local Authority

- NONE RECEIVED

Political Groups

- NONE RECEIVED

Councillors

- Councillor T. Combellack (Rushcliffe Borough Council)
- Councillor P. Gowland (Rushcliffe Borough Council) (two submissions)
- Councillor R. Jones (Rushcliffe Borough Council)
- Councillors C. Thomas, K. Shaw & L. Way (Rushcliffe Borough Council)
- Councillor R. Walker (Rushcliffe Borough Council)

Local Organisations

- Upper Saxondale Residents' Association

Parish and Town Councils

- Bradmore Parish Council
- East Leake Parish Council
- Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council
- Kinoulton Parish Council
- Ruddington Parish Council
- Shelford Parish Council

Local Residents

- 22 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 fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
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. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents

Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
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

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