

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Nottinghamshire County Council

Electoral review

November 2015

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2015

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	7
Draft recommendations	7
Final recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	8
Ashfield District	9
Bassetlaw District	11
Broxtowe Borough	14
Gedling Borough	19
Mansfield District	20
Newark & Sherwood District	21
Rushcliffe Borough	27
Conclusions	33
Parish electoral arrangements	33
3 What happens next?	35

Appendices

A Table A1: Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council	36
B Submissions received	41
C Glossary and abbreviations	44

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. 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.

Electoral review

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 should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Nottinghamshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Nottinghamshire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Nottinghamshire. Overall, 33% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. Kirkby in Ashfield South division currently has 26% more electors than the average for Nottinghamshire.

Our proposals for Nottinghamshire

Nottinghamshire County Council currently has 67 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we considered the retention of a council size of 67 members. However, in drawing up division arrangements we identified that a council size of 66 provided a better allocation of councillors between the districts in the county. We consider that a reduction in council size by one to 66 members will enable the Council to continue to discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Nottinghamshire County Council's 66 councillors should represent 46 single-member divisions and 10 two-member divisions. Three of our proposed 56 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2020.

We have now finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements for Nottinghamshire.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Nottinghamshire County Council's ('the Council's') electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council, as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation: first on division patterns for the county and secondly on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

This review was conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
21 October 2014	Council size decision
28 October 2014	Invitation to submit proposals for division arrangements to LGBCE
10 February 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
9 June 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
11 August 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
17 November 2015	Publication of final recommendations

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 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 instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors² in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table, below.

	2014	2020
Electorate of Nottinghamshire	600,474	638,195
Number of councillors	66	66
Average number of electors per councillor	9,098	9,670

10 Under our final recommendations, three of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2020. The outliers are Newstead and Blidworth which would each have 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 and Southwell which would have 11% more. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Nottinghamshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between borough wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single borough ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

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

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices (by appointment). All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

² Electors refer to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the 2009 Act, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in November 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling districts and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 6% to 2020.

15 During the initial stages of the review, the Council provided a number of revisions to its forecast figures to reflect more up-to-date information that became available as the district councils drew up new polling district information in districts that had been subject to recent electoral reviews. The Council's electoral forecasts indicated significant growth in Ashfield, Broxtowe, Mansfield, Newark & Sherwood and Rushcliffe and less growth in Bassetlaw and Gedling.

16 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

17 Prior to consultation on division boundaries, Nottinghamshire County Council submitted a proposal that the existing council size of 67 members be retained. We also received a joint proposal from the Opposition Groups on the Council (which includes the Conservative Group, Liberal Democrat Group and Independent Group) for an increase in council size of four, from 67 to 71.

18 On balance, we considered that the Council's submission for 67 members provided more persuasive evidence than that of the Opposition Groups. Having considered the evidence we invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 67.

19 We explained to all interested parties from the outset that this council size figure provided a context for local stakeholders to submit their views on the wider electoral arrangements. Furthermore, we made clear that this council size figure could be slightly adjusted in order to provide for division patterns that provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

20 In the development of our draft recommendations we investigated whether a council size of 67 provided the best allocation of councillors to the seven districts in Nottinghamshire. Our investigations indicated that under a council size of 67, Gedling should be allocated 9.49 councillors, but in the county-wide proposal it had been given 10 councillors. Therefore, this meant that all the divisions in Gedling were likely to be over-represented. Our investigations indicated that 66 councillors would provide a better allocation of councillors between the districts in the county. Under a council size of 66, Gedling would be allocated 9.35 councillors. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 66.

21 In response to the draft recommendations we received no significant comments on council size and have therefore decided to confirm a council size of 66 for Nottinghamshire County Council as final.

Division patterns

22 During consultation on division patterns, we received 62 submissions, including one county-wide proposal. The Conservative Group on the Council put forward specific proposals for Bassetlaw and Ashfield districts and provided comments for the remainder of the county. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements for particular districts or specific areas of districts.

23 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we based our draft recommendations broadly on the Council's proposals, but subject to amendments in all districts. These amendments sought to reflect other comments received, strengthen boundaries and/or further improve levels of electoral equality.

24 Our draft recommendations were for 48 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions. We considered that our draft recommendations provided for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

Draft recommendations

25 We received 209 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These provided a mixture of support and objections across the county. These are detailed in Appendix B.

Final recommendations

Ashfield

26 We received support and objections for our draft recommendation for three single-member divisions for Hucknall. The support for single-member divisions argued that they used clear boundaries and ensured that individual councillors were more accountable to the electorate. The objections argued in support of the existing three-member division, stating that it enables councillors to cover each other and reflects the fact that Hucknall is a cohesive community. On balance, we are not persuaded that the existing three-member division better reflects the area and are therefore confirming the three single-member wards as part of the final recommendations.

Bassetlaw

27 We received significant objections to our draft recommendation to place Beckingham and Saundby parishes in Tuxford division, with respondents citing links, including the use of community facilities in the Misterton division. Although transferring these parishes would worsen electoral equality it would improve coterminosity and better reflect communities. We are therefore adopting this amendment as part of our final recommendations.

Broxtowe

28 We received objections to our draft recommendations throughout Broxtowe. We received alternative proposals in the south around the areas of Stapleford and Bramcote, and in the north around Brinsley, Eastwood and Greasley. We have

decided not to modify our draft recommendations in the south of the districts as the alternative proposals included a division that had no clear community links. We are proposing revisions to our three divisions in the north area to better reflect community identities.

Gedling

29 In Gedling we received objections to the draft recommendations, particularly in the Gedling area. We also received a district-wide scheme that proposed changes to all divisions except Newstead, and in part sought to resolve the objections to the Gedling area. This proposal had a number of relatively poor variances and also created a division that contained areas with no internal road links. We have therefore decided not to modify our draft recommendations and are confirming them as final.

Newark & Sherwood

30 We received objections to our draft recommendations in a number of areas in Newark & Sherwood. A large number of respondents objected to the proposal to include Oxtun parish in the Blidworth division. We also received an objection to the inclusion of Coddington parish in the Newark East division, with a request to transfer it to the Collingham division. As a result of the evidence received we are proposing changes to the Blidworth, Collingham, Newark East and Southwell divisions.

Rushcliffe

31 In Rushcliffe we received significant objections to the Bingham West and Ruddington divisions. We propose amendments to the Bingham West division to better reflect communities. In the Ruddington and Soar Valley areas we have explored options to address the concerns raised and concluded that there is no viable single-member option that addresses the concerns of the parishes that wish to be included in the Soar Valley. We are therefore proposing a two-member Leake & Ruddington division, comprising the draft recommendations Ruddington and Soar Valley divisions.

Detailed divisions

32 The tables on pages 9 - 32 detail our final recommendations for each area of Nottinghamshire. Where we have moved away from our draft recommendations, we have outlined how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

Ashfield District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Ashfields	1	-6 %	This division comprises Ashfields, Larwood and Leamington district wards.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Ashfields division as final.
Hucknall North	1	-6%	This division comprises Hucknall North ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	In response to the draft recommendations we received objections and support to our draft recommendations for the Hucknall area. A number of responses expressed a preference for the existing three-member Hucknall division, arguing that having three members would provide cover for each councillor and reflect the cohesive nature of the Hucknall area. They argued that it was the existing division and had worked well. We also received support for our proposed single-member divisions, with respondents arguing that they used strong boundaries and also provided better accountability. We noted that a number of arguments in support and opposition to our draft recommendations were based on principles in favour of either single- or multi-member divisions. As detailed in our guidance, we do not base decisions on the principle of either a single- or multi-member division. We have therefore considered the evidence received in the context of the statutory criteria. We recognise that arguments were made that dividing Hucknall between divisions would not reflect community identities. Whilst we note that people have a local affinity with Hucknall we were also mindful that Hucknall had recently been divided into four wards as part of our recent electoral review of Ashfield District
Hucknall South	1	-9%	This division comprises Hucknall Central ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	
Hucknall West	1	-8%	This division comprises Hucknall West ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	

				Council. We therefore considered that as Hucknall is divided at district ward level it could also be divided at county division level. We do consider that our three single-member divisions for Hucknall do provide a good balance between the criteria, particularly that they have clear boundaries (as was supported in representations made during the consultation) and provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality. We are therefore confirming the three single-member wards for Hucknall as final.
Kirkby North	1	1%	This division comprises Abbey Hill and Summit wards, and part of Kingsway ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Kirkby North division as final.
Kirkby South	1	5%	This division comprises Annesley & Kirkby Woodhouse and Kirkby Cross & Portland ward, and part of Kingsway ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Kirkby South division as final.
Selston	1	9%	This division comprises Jacksdale, Selston and Underwood wards.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Selston division as final.
Sutton Central & East	1	-4%	This division comprises Central & New Cross and Sutton Junction & Harlow Wood wards, and part of St Mary's ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Sutton Central & East division as final.
Sutton North	1	2%	This division comprises The Dales, Skegby and Stanton Hill & Teversal wards.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Sutton North division as final.

Sutton West	1	4%	This division comprises Carsic and Huthwaite & Brierley wards, and part of St Mary's ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Sutton West division as final.
-------------	---	----	--	--

Bassetlaw District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Blyth & Harworth	1	5%	This division comprises Harworth and Langold wards, and Blyth and Styrrup with Oldcotes parishes of Blyth ward.	We received no significant comments in response to our draft recommendations and are therefore confirming our Blyth & Harworth division as final.
Misterton	1	10%	This division comprises Beckingham, Clayworth, Everton, Misterton and Ranskill wards, and Scrooby parish of Blyth ward and Lound and Sutton parishes of Sutton ward.	We received a number of responses objecting to our proposals to included Beckingham and Saundby parishes in our Tuxford division. Respondents highlighted the 'long-established' links between Beckingham and the Misterton area, including schools, churches and other community facilities, such as the swimming pool at Misterton Primary School. Transferring these parishes would worsen electoral equality in Misterton and Tuxford divisions from 1% fewer and 3% more electors than the county average in 2020 to 10% more and 9% fewer, respectively. However, on balance in light of persuasive evidence of local community links we propose making this amendment as part of our final recommendations.
Retford East	1	-1%	This division comprises East Retford East and East Retford South wards.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Retford East division as final.

Retford West	1	1%	This division comprises East Retford North and East Retford West ward, and Babworth and Barnby Moor parishes of Sutton ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Retford West division as final.
Tuxford	1	-9%	This division comprises East Markham, Rampton, Sturton and Tuxford & Trent wards.	As discussed in the Misterton section (above), we are including Beckingham and Saundby parishes in our Misterton division. We did not receive any other significant comments in relation to the Tuxford division and are therefore confirming the modified Tuxford division as final.
Worksop East	1	4%	This division comprises Worksop East ward, part of Worksop North ward, part of Worksop North West ward, and part of Worksop South East ward.	We received a proposal to modify this division, suggesting that the division boundary should be tied to the boundaries of wards of Bassetlaw District Council. It was argued that the proposed Worksop East division divided the Manton area which has strong boundaries and also distinct community issues. We note the evidence for not dividing the Manton area, but the proposal to base the division on Worksop East and Worksop South East wards would create a division with 12% more electors than the county average. Although the evidence provided was good, the alternate proposal would require a significant redrawing of the boundaries throughout Worksop and when combined with the poor electoral equality that the proposed Worksop East division would have, we do not consider there to be persuasive evidence to include this proposal and the consequential modifications as part of our final recommendations. We did not receive any other significant comments on this area so we are therefore confirming our Worksop East division as final.

Worksop North	1	5%	This division comprises Carlton and Worksop North East wards, and part of Worksop North ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Worksop North division as final.
Worksop South	1	5%	This division comprises Welbeck and Worksop South wards, and part of Worksop South East ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Worksop South division as final.
Worksop West	1	7%	This division comprises part of Worksop North ward and part of Worksop North West ward.	We received no significant comments in response to the draft recommendations and are therefore confirming the Worksop West division as final.

Broxtowe Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Beeston Central & Rylands	1	-3%	This division comprises Beeston Central and Beeston Rylands wards, and part of Beeston West ward.	We received a number of objections to our proposals in the Stapleford and Bramcote area, including a proposal for alternate boundaries to the Beeston Central & Rylands division. However, as described in the Stapleford & Broxtowe Central section (below), we have not included this alternative proposal as part of our final recommendations. In light of no other significant comments we are confirming our Beeston Central & Rylands division as final.
Bramcote & Beeston North	1	6%	This division comprises Beeston North ward, part of Beeston West ward, and part of Bramcote ward.	We received a number of objections to our proposal to split the Bramcote area, with part remaining in a division with Stapleford while the rest is in a division with Beeston. We note the arguments that the area of Bramcote to the west of the roundabout is considered part of Bramcote and that the roundabout does not provide a significant barrier. In addition,

				respondents argued that Bramcote and Stapleford have links and share a number of services. We received requests to retain Stapleford and Bramcote in a single division, as at present. We considered this option as part of our draft recommendations and noted that while it would be possible to create a two-member division covering this area it is not possible to accommodate this while securing good levels of electoral equality elsewhere, particularly to the north. Although we have received evidence for the links between the two areas, we remain unable to propose a division combining them as we have, and have not received suggestions for alternative proposals for the surrounding area. We did receive a proposal that would retain the whole of Bramcote in a single division; however, we are not including this proposals in our final recommendations as it was dependent on the creation of a division combining part of Stapleford with an area of Toton, but without any direct road links. Although it was argued that the area of Stapleford and Toton would share similar issues with the advent of High Speed Two, we considered the lack of direct links did not make this viable. On balance, we are confirming the draft recommendations for Bramcote & Beeston North as final.
Eastwood	1	4%	This division comprises Eastwood Hall, Eastwood Hilltop and Eastwood St Mary's wards.	We received objections to the proposed Eastwood & Brinsley division and also the proposed division in the surrounding area. The objections centred on the proposal to split Eastwood parish and the Eastwood Hilltop ward of Broxtowe Borough Council between three divisions. Respondents argued that the proposal divided the Eastwood area and that splitting the area

				between three divisions would create confusion locally. They also objected to a division linking parts of Eastwood with Kimberley. We received a number of objections to the inclusion of Brinsley parish in a division with Eastwood. Respondents argued that Brinsley has a number facilities itself and that they go beyond Eastwood for larger services. They cited links to Greasley. We also received a response that suggested that Brinsley residents do in fact use services in Eastwood, although this was refuted by another respondent. We received a number of alternative proposals that sought to address the issues here and in the surrounding area including Greasley, Kimberley and Nuthall. Two options retained the link between Eastwood and Brinsley but excluded the Coach Drive and Brunel Avenue areas of Greasley parish that were recently transferred to the Eastwood Hall ward as part of the Broxtowe Borough Council electoral review. Our draft recommendations sought to retain these areas in an Eastwood division, so we are not proposing these alternatives. A third alternative included Brinsley in a division with the Greasley parish (excluding the Coach Drive and Brunel Avenue areas), while retaining the whole of Eastwood parish and the three Eastwood borough wards in a single division. We discounted such an option during our deliberations on the draft recommendations because Brinsley does not have direct road links to Greasley. In addition, it has a knock-on effect of creating a Nuthall & Kimberley division elsewhere with 10% more electors than the county average. However, we note that Brinsley does have good road links to Greasley running just
--	--	--	--	--

				outside the borough in neighbouring Ashfield and that the proposal secures good electoral equality. We are of the view that this alternative proposal reflects the evidence received and would better reflect the statutory criteria. We are therefore proposing an Eastwood division comprising Eastwood Hall, Eastwood Hilltop and Eastwood St Mary's wards. This division would have 4% more electors than the county average by 2020.
Greasley & Brinsley	1	4%	This division comprises Brinsley and Greasley wards and Greasley Watnall parish ward of Watnall & Nuthall West ward.	As stated in the Eastwood section (above), we received a number of objections to the inclusion of Brinsley in a division with Eastwood. We also received objections to the division of Greasley parish between divisions. As stated in the Eastwood section we received a number of alternative proposals that sought to address these issues for this area, but rejected some as they did not reflect the inclusion of parts of Greasley parish to the Eastwood Hall ward as part of the recent Broxtowe Borough Council electoral review. We are adopting the proposal to include Brinsley and Greasley in a division. Although we excluded this option during our deliberations on the draft recommendations as these parishes do not have direct road links within the borough, in light of the evidence received we have been persuaded that they should be in the same division, utilising the road links a short way through Ashfield Borough. The Greasley & Brinsley division would have 4% more electors than the county average by 2020.
Nuthall & Kimberley	1	10%	This division comprises Kimberley ward and the Nuthall parish areas of	As stated in the Eastwood section (above), we received a number of objections to our draft recommendation to include part of Eastwood in a division with Kimberley. In response to

			Nuthall East & Strelley and Watnall & Nuthall West wards.	proposed modifications to Eastwood, Greasley and Brinsley, proposals were put forward for a Nuthall & Kimberley division. This would comprise Kimberley ward and the Nuthall parish areas of Nuthall East & Strelley and Watnall & Nuthall West wards. We note that this division would have 10% more electors than the county average by 2020; however, it avoids the transfer of parts of Eastwood to a division with Kimberley and creates a more compact Nuthall & Kimberley division. We are therefore adopting this as a part of the final recommendations.
Stapleford & Broxtowe Central	2	-6%	This division comprises Awsworth, Cossall & Trowell, Stapleford North, Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West wards, part of Bramcote ward, and part of Nuthall & Strelley ward.	As stated in the Bramcote & Beeston North section (above), we received a number of requests to retain Stapleford and Bramcote in a single division, as at present, but have not proposed this. While it would be possible to create a two-member division covering this area it is not possible to accommodate this while securing good levels of electoral equality elsewhere, particularly to the north. In addition, we also received a proposal that divided Stapleford into two divisions with one division covered by Stapleford North and Awsworth, Cossall & Trowell wards and Strelley parish of Nuthall East & Strelley ward and a second comprising Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West wards and part of Toton. As stated above, we have not included this proposal in our final recommendations as we do not consider that the division comprising Stapleford South East and Stapleford South West wards with Toton reflects communities. We note the argument that these areas will be affected by High Speed Two, but do not consider this sufficient to justify a division with no internal road links. Therefore, we are not adopting this proposal.

				Finally, we note that a number of respondents objected to the proposed name for Stapleford & Broxtowe Central. There were no consistent suggestions, although some respondents suggested the name should reflect the other villages within the division. While we note this concern, we consider that a name for example reflecting Stapleford, Awsworth, Cossall, Trowell and Strelley is unwieldy and long. We are therefore retaining the name Stapleford & Broxtowe Central in our final recommendations.
Toton, Chilwell & Attenborough	2	3%	This division comprises Attenborough & Chilwell East, Chilwell West and Toton & Chilwell Meadows wards, and part of Beeston West ward.	As stated in the Bramcote & Beeston North section (above), we did receive a proposal to modify the division pattern in this area, but we rejected this because of the creation of a division comprising part of Toton with Stapleford which we do not consider would reflect community identities. We also received comments objecting to the fact that the division contains part of Beeston, but that this is not reflected in the division name. As stated in the Stapleford & Broxtowe Central section (above), while we acknowledge the concerns about reflecting the names of areas within a proposed division, we have to balance this against creating unwieldy and long names. We are therefore retaining the name Toton, Chilwell & Attenborough in our final recommendations. We received no other significant comments on this area and are confirming the Toton, Chilwell & Attenborough division.

Gedling Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Arnold North	2	4%	This division comprises Coppice and Plains wards, part of Bestwood St Albans ward, part of Ernehale ward, and part of Redhill district ward.	In Gedling Borough we received a number of objections to the proposed Calverton division, particularly the proposal to transfer part of Gedling to this division. Objections focused on the lack of community links between the area to the north of Arnold Road with the rural Calverton area and also that the boundary divided All Hallows CoE Church from All Hallows CoE Primary School. We also received proposals for a totally revised set of division boundaries for the borough, with the exception of Newstead division. These proposals focused in part on the concerns about the split of the Gedling area, but also concerns that the draft recommendations split part of the Carlton area with part of the area including in and Arnold division.. There were also concerns that the draft recommendations split the Netherfield area. Finally, the proposal acknowledged that it would transfer an area of Burton Joyce parish to the Calverton division that has no direct road links within the borough. We also received a number of objections to the proposal to transfer part of Burton Joyce to a division with Calverton, with respondents highlighting the lack of direct links within the borough to the Calverton area. We have given careful consideration to the evidence received. We note the objections to the draft proposal to include part of the Gedling area in a division with Calverton. However, we do not consider that the alternative to include part of Burton Joyce
Arnold South	2	7%	This division comprises Daybrook, Porchester and Woodthorpe wards, part of Ernehale ward, and part of Phoenix wards.	
Calverton	1	6%	This division comprises Dumbles ward, part of Calverton ward, and part of Gedling ward.	
Carlton East	1	4%	This division comprises Colwick and Trent Valley wards, part of Gedling ward, and part of Netherfield ward.	
Carlton West	2	6%	This division comprises Carlton, Carlton Hill and Cavendish wards, part of Gedling ward, part of Netherfield ward, and part of Phoenix district ward.	
Newstead	1	-11%	This division comprises Newstead Abbey ward, part of Bestwood St Albans ward,	

			part of Calverton ward, and part of Redhill ward.	parish provides any stronger division pattern, particularly given the lack of internal road links within the borough. Although occasionally we will propose divisions with no internal road links, such as in Greasley & Brinsley (above) and under the draft recommendations for Soar Valley (below). In the case of Brinsley, this is because there was local support for it, and in the Soar Valley a lack of alternative options. In this case, while we acknowledge the limitations of the alternative, we consider that the draft recommendation better reflect the statutory criteria. In addition, these alternative proposals would require a very substantial redrawing of the draft recommendations and we do not consider that persuasive evidence has been provided to justify this. Although we note the concerns about splitting areas, particularly Netherfield and part of Carlton, this is unavoidable if trying to secure good electoral equality while reflecting other comments received. We are therefore confirming the draft recommendations for Gedling as final.
--	--	--	---	---

Mansfield District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Mansfield East	2	-1%	This division comprises Holly, Kingsway, Lindhurst, Ling Forest, Maun Valley, Newlands, Oak Tree and Ransom Wood wards.	We received no significant comments on the draft recommendations for Mansfield and are therefore confirming them as final.

Mansfield North	2	-6%	This division comprises Hornby, Manor, Park Hall, Peafields, Sherwood, Woodhouse, Woodlands and Yeoman Hill wards.	
Mansfield South	2	2%	This division comprises Berry Hill, Carr Bank, Eakring, Kings Walk, Newgate, Oakham, Racecourse and Sandhurst wards, and part of Portland ward.	
Mansfield West	2	-5%	This division comprises Abbott, Brick Kiln, Broomhill, Bull Farm & Pleasley Hill, Grange Farm, Ladybrook and Penniment wards, and part of Portland ward.	
Warsop	1	0%	This division comprises Market Warsop, Meden, Netherfield and Warsop Carrs wards.	

Newark & Sherwood District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Balderton	1	3%	This division comprises Balderton South ward, part of Balderton North & Coddington ward, and Alverton, Cotham, Fernwood, Kilvington and Staunton	We received objections to our draft recommendations, particularly to the creation of additional parish wards in Balderton parish and the division of the parish between three divisions. It was argued that the parish is entitled to a single councillor.

			parishes of Farndon & Fernwood ward.	We have given consideration to the evidence and while we note that the parish would be entitled to a single councillor it is not possible to propose such a division while securing good electoral arrangements, with good electoral equality and strong boundaries in the surrounding area. Therefore, we do not propose creating a division based solely on Balderton parish. Finally, we note the concerns about the creation of further parish wards, but consider these necessary to secure good electoral equality, particularly in the Newark West division. We are therefore confirming the Balderton division as final.
Blidworth	1	-11%	This division comprises Rainworth South & Blidworth ward and Rainworth parish of Rainworth North & Rufford ward.	We received significant objections to the inclusion of Oxtun parish in the Blidworth division. Respondents argued that Oxtun parish has strong community links to other parishes in the Dover Beck ward and also uses facilities in Southwell. They stated that they had no community links to Blidworth and that the road links are limited. We note these objections and consider that there is evidence of Oxtun's links to the Dover Beck area of the Southwell division. However, we also note that transferring Oxtun parish would worsen electoral equality in Blidworth to 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 and worsen it in Southwell from 3% more to 7% more. On balance, we consider that this relatively poor level of electoral equality can be justified by the community links indicated between these areas. We are therefore including Oxtun parish in our Southwell division. The modified Blidworth division would have 11% fewer electors than county average by 2020.
Collingham	1	1%	This division comprises Bridge and Collingham wards and Barnby in the Willows	We received significant evidence for the inclusion of Coddington parish in the Collingham division, with a small area of the Newark town area transferred to Newark East division in

			and Coddington parishes of Balderton North & Coddington ward.	order to maintain reasonable levels of electoral equality. The evidence received indicated that Coddington parish and the parishes in the Collingham division have shared concerns over highways, gravel extraction and local policing. We consider that persuasive evidence has been provided for the inclusion of Coddington in the Collingham division and that the transfer of a small area of Newark Town from Collingham to the Newark East division would still provide strong boundaries while securing good electoral equality. Transferring these areas would improve electoral equality in Collingham division from 4% fewer to 1% more electors than the county average by 2020, while slightly worsening it in Newark East division from 1% fewer to 3% fewer. Having considered the evidence we are broadly happy with this modification, although we have a concern that it would leave Barnby in the Willows parish isolated. We are therefore including this parish in the Collingham division, along with Coddington parish. This would slightly improve electoral equality in Coddington division to 1% more electors than the county average in 2020, while worsening it to 5% fewer in Newark East division.
Farndon & Trent	1	-9%	This division comprises Castle ward, East Stoke, Elston, Farndon, Hawton, Syerston and Thorpe parishes of Farndon & Fernwood ward and Averham, Bleasby, Fiskerton cum Morton, Kelham,	We received a number of objections to the creation of a division bisected by the river Trent, particularly the inclusion of a part of Newark town to provide a crossing point within the division. It was also argued that Upton parish is better situated in the Southwell division, reflecting local community links. We note these objections and particularly the evidence for the inclusion of Upton parish the Southwell division. However, we have to balance this against our proposal to include Oxtun

			Rolleston and Staythorpe parishes of Trent ward.	parish in the Southwell division. This proposal worsens Southwell from 3% more electors than the county average in 2020 to 7% more and transferring Upton would worsen it further to 11% more, while worsening it in Farndon & Trent to 9% fewer. We also note that it would reduce coterminosity since Upton parish sits in the Trent ward, which is wholly in the Farndon & Trent division. On balance, in light of the community identity evidence we are proposing to include Upton parish in the Southwell division. The revised Farndon & Trent division would have 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2020.
Muskham & Farnsfield	1	8%	This division comprises Bilsthorpe, Farnsfield and Muskham wards; Mickledale parish ward of Rufford parish; Edingley, Halam, Hockerton, Kirklington and Winkburn parishes of Southwell ward; and Carlton-on-Trent, Grassthorpe, Kersall, Kneesall, Maplebeck, Ompton, Ossington, Sutton-on-Trent and Weston parishes of Sutton-on-Trent ward.	We received a mixture of support and objections for this division. It was suggested that the Mickledale parish ward of Rufford parish should be in the Muskham & Farnsfield division, rather than the Sherwood division, reflecting the fact it is in the Bilsthorpe ward. It was also suggested that Eglington parish would be better situated in the Muskham & Farnsfield division, reflecting its more rural nature and lack of links to Ollerton. We note the suggestion that the Mickledale parish ward of Rufford parish should be in the Muskham & Farnsfield division. Including this area would slightly worsen electoral equality in Muskham & Farnsfield division from 7% more electors than the county average by 2020 to 8% more. It would also worsen electoral equality in Sherwood Forest from 4% fewer to 5% fewer electors. We also note the argument that Eglington parish should be included in the Muskham & Farnsfield division. While we acknowledge these concerns they must also be balanced against the worsening of electoral equality that would result. If

				we adopted this amendment along with the transfer of Mickledale parish ward, electoral equality in Muskham & Farnsfield would worsen to 11% more electors than the county average by 2020. On balance, we do not consider that there is persuasive evidence to justify this level of electoral equality so we cannot adopt both amendments. Our tour of the area confirmed that the Mickledale parish ward is essentially part of Bilsthorpe and that it should be in this division along with the remainder of Bilsthorpe ward so we are including this amendment as part of the final recommendations.
Newark East	1	-5%	This division comprises part of Balderton North & Coddington ward, and part of Beacon ward.	We received a number of objections to our proposals to create additional parish wards in the Newark town area. We note the concerns about the creation of additional parish wards in the Newark town area, but unfortunately using the existing district and parish wards does not secure good levels of electoral equality and it has been necessary to further divide areas. In addition, as discussed in the Collingham section (above), we received persuasive argument for including Coddington parish in the Collingham division and transferring part of Newark town in the Collingham division to Newark East. We have been persuaded to transfer Coddington parish to Collingham division, in exchange for an area of Newark town. We additionally propose to include Barnby in the Willows parish in our Collingham division to avoid leaving this rural parish isolated. These amendments would worsen electoral equality from 1% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 to 5% fewer.

Newark West	1	-7%	This division comprises Devon ward and part of Beacon ward.	As stated in the Newark East section (above), we received a number of objections to the creation of new parish wards in Newark town as part of our draft recommendations. As explained, using the existing district and parish wards does not secure good levels of electoral equality and it has been necessary to further divide areas. In light of the lack of viable alternative proposals, we are confirming the draft recommendations for Newark West as final.
Ollerton	1	4%	This division comprises Boughton and Ollerton wards and Egmanton and Laxton & Moorhouse parishes of Sutton-on-Trent ward.	As stated in the Muskham & Farnsfield section (above), we received comments arguing that Egmanton parish would be better included in the Muskham & Farnsfield division. However, in light of other modifications to the Muskham & Farnsfield division, we have not included this proposal in our final recommendations. We received no other significant comments on the Ollerton division and are confirming it as final.
Sherwood Forest	1	-5%	This division comprises Edwinstowe & Clipstone ward; and Eakring and Wellow parishes of Rainworth North & Rufford ward and Forest parish ward of Rufford parish.	As stated in the Muskham & Farnsfield section (above), we received comments arguing that Mickledale parish ward of Rufford parish would be better included in the Muskham & Farnsfield division. We are including this amendment as our tour of the area confirmed that it is essentially part of Bilsthorpe and would be better served in a division with the rest of Bilsthorpe. Transferring this area worsens electoral equality in Sherwood Forest from 4% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 to 5% fewer. We received no other significant comments on the Sherwood Forest division and are confirming it as final subject to the modification above.

Southwell	1	11%	This division comprises Dover Beck and Lowdham wards, Upton parish of Trent ward and Halloughton and Southwell parishes of Southwell ward.	We received a mixture of support and objections for this division. As described in the Blidworth section (above), there were significant objections to the inclusion of Oxtun parish in the Blidworth division. Respondents argued that it has stronger links to the Dover Beck area of Southwell. In addition, as discussed in the Farndon & Trent section (above), there was a request to transfer Upton parish to the Southwell division, outlining the area's links to Southwell. Adopting both amendments would worsen electoral equality in Southwell division from 3% more electors than the county average to 11% more. In addition, it worsened electoral equality in Blidworth and Farndon & Trent from 6% fewer and 5% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 to 11% fewer and 9% fewer, respectively. As stated above, we consider persuasive community identity evidence has been provided to include both Oxtun and Upton parishes in the Southwell division. Although electoral equality worsens, we consider the balance with the community identity evidence outweighs this. We are therefore including Oxtun and Upton parishes in the Southwell division and subject to this modification are confirming it as final.
-----------	---	-----	--	--

Rushcliffe Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Bingham East	1	-4%	This division comprises Bingham East, Cranmer and	We received limited comments on our proposals for this division, although one respondent did suggest an amendment.

			Thoroton wards; Wiverton Hall parish of Cropwell district ward; and East Bridgford and Kneeton parishes of East Bridgford ward.	However, this would have significant knock-on effects to the surrounding divisions and we consider that there was insufficient evidence to support this. We are therefore confirming the Bingham East division as final.
Bingham West	1	-8%	This division comprises Bingham West ward; Cropwell Bishop, Cropwell Butler and Tithby parishes of Cropwell ward; Newton parish of East Bridgford ward; and Colston Bassett parish and part of Langer cum Barnstone parish in Nevile & Langer ward.	We received a large number of objections to the inclusion of Shelford parish in the Bingham West division. Respondents cited a lack of direct links to Bingham, instead highlighting a range of community links with the Radcliffe on Trent area. Some respondents suggested that the neighbouring Newton parish was best served in the Bingham West division. We note the evidence and acknowledge that Shelford parish has good links to Radcliffe on Trent. Transferring the parish would worsen electoral equality in Bingham West from 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 to 8% fewer. It would also worsen electoral equality in Radcliffe on Trent from 1% more electors than the county average by 2020 to 3% more. However, on balance, we consider that the evidence received is persuasive and supports these levels of electoral equality. We have therefore decided to include Shelford parish in our Radcliffe on Trent division.
Cotgrave	1	-8%	This division comprises Cotgrave ward, Kinoulton and Owthorpe parishes of Nevile & Langer ward, and Clipston, Normanton on the Wolds and Tollerton parishes of Tollerton ward.	We received some support for this division, although a number of respondents argued that it should be renamed Cotgrave to reflect the largest town in the division. In addition, as described in the Keyworth section (below), there was a suggestion for transferring Kinoulton parish out of the division. As stated in the Keyworth section, we have not included the proposal to transfer Kinoulton parish to Keyworth division. We are therefore confirming the boundaries of the Tollerton division

				as final. However, we do propose renaming it Cotgrave to reflect that this is the largest town in the area.
Keyworth	1	-9%	This division comprises Keyworth & Wolds ward, and Costock, Rempstone, Thorpe in the Glebe and Wysall parishes of Bunny ward, Hickling and Upper Broughton parishes of Nevile & Langer ward, and Plumtree parish of Tollerton ward.	We received submissions arguing for the inclusion of Kinoulton parish in the Keyworth division. Respondents argued that it formed part of the Nevile & Langer district ward, which reflected its links to Hickling and Upper Broughton parishes. They cited a range of community links and questioned whether it had any links to Tollerton or Cotgrave. While transferring Kinoulton parish to the Keyworth division would improve electoral equality in the division, it would significantly worsen it in Tollerton division from 8% fewer electors than the county average to 16% fewer. We do not consider there to be persuasive evidence to justify such a poor level of electoral equality. In addition, any attempt to address this electoral imbalance would require a significant redrawing of the boundaries in the surrounding divisions and, again, we do not consider there to be sufficient evidence for this. We are therefore confirming the Keyworth division as final.
Leake & Ruddington	2	-7%	This division comprises Leake, Gotham, Ruddington and Sutton Bonington wards and Bunny and Bradmore parishes of Bunny ward.	We received significant objections to the proposed Ruddington division with respondents objecting the inclusion of parishes normally associated with the Soar Valley in a division with Ruddington. They cited the lack of community links to Ruddington and the fact that the only road links were via Nottingham. In addition, they expressed concerns that the rural issues faced by these parishes would not be reflected in a division dominated by Ruddington. Finally, they cited links to the other parishes in the Soar Valley area. We received limited alternative proposals, although there was a suggestion that the area Clifton Pastures development in

				Barton in Fabis parish could be transferred to the Ruddington division. This proposal would result in the warding of Barton in Fabis parish, which would keep the village area in a division with other Soar Valley communities. We note the objections to the draft recommendations and acknowledge the concerns of the parishes in this area. We have examined the suggestion of splitting Barton in Fabis parish, transferring just the Clifton Pastures area to Ruddington division. However, while transferring Thrumpton and Ratcliffe on Soar and part of Barton in Fabis parishes to the Soar Valley division would actually improve electoral equality to 1% fewer electors than the county average by 2020, it would worsen it in the Ruddington division from 9% fewer to 14% fewer. We do not consider there to be sufficient evidence to justify this level of electoral equality. During the deliberations on the draft recommendations we considered a number of options for this area, including a two-member division covering the area of our proposed Ruddington and Soar Valley divisions. However, we determined that it would be better to consult on a pattern of single-member divisions. In light of the evidence received in response to the draft recommendations and in the light of no viable single-member alternatives, we have revisited the option of a two-member division and note that it would enable these parishes to retain their links with the remainder of the Soar Valley, while also creating a division with good electoral equality. We are therefore including this division as part of the final recommendations. The proposed division would be called Leake & Ruddington and would have 7% fewer electors than the county average by 2020.
--	--	--	--	--

Radcliffe on Trent	1	3%	This division comprises Gamston North and Radcliffe on Trent wards, and Shelford parish of East Bridgford ward.	As stated in the Bingham West section (above), we received a number of responses arguing for the inclusion of Shelford parish in the Radcliffe on Trent division. In light of the evidence we have decided to include this amendment as part of our final recommendations. We also received objections to the inclusion of Gamston and Holme Pierrepont parishes in the Radcliffe on Tent division, with respondents arguing that Gamston area is part of Bridgford, citing links there. We acknowledge the concerns about the inclusion of the Gamston and Holme Pierrepont parishes in the Radcliffe on Trent division. However, as with the deliberations on the draft recommendations we have been unable to identify any alternatives that better reflect local communities, while also securing good levels of electoral equality. We also note that no other respondents have put forward viable alternative proposals. Therefore, subject to the transfer of Shelford parish to Radcliffe on Trent division we are confirming this division as final.
West Bridgford North	1	3%	This division comprises Lady Bay and Trent Bridge wards, and part of Abbey ward.	As stated in the Radcliffe on Trent section (above), we received objections to the inclusion of Gamston and Holme Pierrepont parishes in the Radcliffe on Trent parish. The respondents suggested that these areas should be in a division with West Bridgford. However, as discussed in more detail above, we have been unable to identify a division pattern that secures good electoral equality while doing this. We received no other significant comments on our proposals for these divisions and are therefore confirming them as final.
West Bridgford South	1	3%	This division comprises Edwalton and Gamston South ward, part of Abbey ward, and Musters ward.	
West Bridgford West	1	-2%	This division comprises Compton Acres and Lutterell	

			wards, and part of Musters ward.	
--	--	--	----------------------------------	--

Conclusions

33 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2020 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	66	66
Number of electoral divisions	56	56
Average number of electors per councillor	9,098	9,670
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	17	3
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendation

Nottinghamshire County Council should comprise 66 councillors serving 56 divisions representing 46 single-member divisions and 10 two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Nottinghamshire. You can also view our final recommendations for Nottinghamshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

34 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 electoral arrangements. However, the district and borough councils in Nottinghamshire 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.

35 As a result of our proposed division 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 Balderton and Newark parishes.

36 As result of our proposed division 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 Balderton parish.

Final recommendation

Balderton Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Balderton Milton (returning one member); Balderton North (returning four members); Balderton Rowan (returning three members); and Balderton South (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

37 As result of our proposed division 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 Newark parish.

Final recommendation

Newark Town Council should return 18 town councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Beacon (returning four members); Bridge (returning three members); Castle (returning two members); Devon (returning five members); Newark East (returning one member); Newark South (returning one member); Magnus (returning one member); and Sleaford (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

38 We have now completed our review of Nottinghamshire 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 2017.

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council

Division name		Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Ashfield District								
1	Ashfields	1	8,047	8,047	-12%	9,129	9,129	-6%
2	Hucknall North	1	7,594	7,594	-17%	9,130	9,130	-6%
3	Hucknall South	1	8,522	8,522	6%	8,816	8,816	-9%
4	Hucknall West	1	8,154	8,154	-11%	8,860	8,860	-8%
5	Kirkby North	1	9,231	9,231	1%	9,775	9,775	1%
6	Kirkby South	1	9,233	9,233	1%	10,127	10,127	5%
7	Selston	1	10,186	10,186	12%	10,522	10,522	9%
8	Sutton Central & East	1	8,962	8,962	-1%	9,320	9,320	-4%
9	Sutton North	1	9,982	9,982	10%	9,909	9,909	2%
10	Sutton West	1	9,918	9,918	9%	10,071	10,071	4%
Bassetlaw District								
11	Blyth & Harworth	1	9,359	9,359	3%	10,197	10,197	5%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
12	Misterton	1	10,489	10,489	15%	10,653	10,653	10%
13	Retford East	1	8,928	8,928	-2%	9,569	9,569	-1%
14	Retford West	1	9,283	9,283	2%	9,745	9,745	1%
15	Tuxford	1	8,729	8,729	-4%	8,846	8,846	-9%
16	Worksop East	1	9,965	9,965	10%	10,078	10,078	4%
17	Worksop North	1	10,126	10,126	11%	10,131	10,131	5%
18	Worksop South	1	9,842	9,842	8%	10,139	10,139	5%
19	Worksop West	1	10,100	10,100	11%	10,379	10,379	7%
Broxtowe Borough								
20	Beeston Central & Rylands	1	8,823	8,823	-3%	9,366	9,366	-3%
21	Bramcote & Beeston North	1	9,655	9,655	6%	10,251	10,251	6%
22	Eastwood	1	9,440	9,440	4%	10,022	10,022	4%
23	Greasley & Brinsley	1	9,457	9,457	4%	10,040	10,040	4%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24	Nuthall & Kimberley	1	10,040	10,040	10%	10,658	10,658	10%
25	Stapleford & Broxtowe Central	2	17,127	8,564	-6%	18,182	9,091	-6%
26	Toton, Chilwell & Attenborough	2	18,880	9,440	4%	19,952	9,976	3%
Gedling Borough								
27	Arnold North	2	19,414	9,707	7%	20,135	10,068	4%
28	Arnold South	2	20,385	10,193	12%	20,789	10,395	7%
29	Calverton	1	9,952	9,952	9%	10,286	10,286	6%
30	Carlton East	1	9,667	9,667	6%	10,074	10,074	4%
31	Carlton West	2	19,961	9,981	10%	20,533	10,267	6%
32	Newstead	1	8,194	8,194	-10%	8,594	8,594	-11%
Mansfield District								
33	Mansfield East	2	17,897	8,949	-2%	19,225	9,613	-1%
34	Mansfield North	2	17,868	8,934	-2%	18,274	9,137	-6%
35	Mansfield South	2	17,966	8,983	-1%	19,646	9,823	2%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
36	Mansfield West	2	16,738	8,369	-8%	18,375	9,188	-5%
37	Warsop	1	9,293	9,293	2%	9,665	9,665	0%
Newark & Sherwood District								
38	Balderton	1	7,560	7,560	-17%	9,953	9,953	3%
39	Blidworth	1	8,055	8,055	-11%	8,647	8,647	-11%
40	Collingham	1	9,405	9,405	3%	9,734	9,734	1%
41	Farndon & Trent	1	7,443	7,443	-18%	8,806	8,806	-9%
42	Muskham & Farnsfield	1	10,088	10,088	11%	10,440	10,440	8%
43	Newark East	1	7,381	7,381	-19%	9,183	9,183	-5%
44	Newark West	1	8,777	8,777	-4%	9,000	9,000	-7%
45	Ollerton	1	9,586	9,586	5%	10,013	10,013	4%
46	Sherwood Forest	1	8,901	8,901	-2%	9,161	9,161	-5%
47	Southwell	1	10,626	10,626	17%	10,710	10,710	11%

Table A1 (cont): Final recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Rushcliffe Borough							
48 Bingham East	1	9,289	9,289	2%	9,297	9,297	-4%
49 Bingham West	1	6,753	6,753	-26%	8,891	8,891	-8%
50 Cotgrave	1	8,095	8,095	-11%	8,888	8,888	-8%
51 Keyworth	1	8,642	8,642	-5%	8,754	8,754	-9%
52 Leake & Ruddington	2	15,372	7,686	-16%	17,891	8,946	-7%
53 Radcliffe on Trent	1	8,670	8,670	-5%	9,970	9,970	3%
54 West Bridgford North	1	9,939	9,939	9%	9,939	9,939	3%
55 West Bridgford South	1	8,804	8,804	-3%	9,974	9,974	3%
56 West Bridgford West	1	9,681	9,681	6%	9,481	9,481	-2%
Totals	66	600,474	–	–	638,195	–	–
Averages	–	–	9,098	–	–	9,670	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Nottinghamshire 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

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/nottinghamshire/nottinghamshire-county-council>

Local authorities

- Nottinghamshire County Council
- Broxtowe Borough Council
- Gedling Borough Council
- Newark and Sherwood District Council

Political groups

- Ashfield District Council Conservatives
- Hucknall Conservatives
- Newark Conservatives
- Nottinghamshire County Council Liberal Democrats
- Sherwood Conservative Association
- Southwell Liberal Democrats

Members of Parliament

- Rt Hon Kenneth Clarke MP
- Vernon Coaker MP
- Robert Jenrick MP
- Gloria De Piero MP
- Rt Hon Anna Soubry MP
- Mark Spencer MP

Members of European Parliament

- Andrew Lewer MBE MEP

Nottinghamshire County Councillors

- Cllr Brooks
- Cllr Butler
- Cllr Gilfoyle
- Cllr Handley
- Cllr Laughton
- Cllr Owen
- Cllr Wilkinson
- Cllr Yates

Borough and District Councillors

- Cllr Bradley (Ashfield District Council)
- Cllr Brand (Bassetlaw District Council)
- Cllr Burton (Bassetlaw District Council)
- Cllr Handley (Broxtowe Borough Council)
- Cllr Mitchell (Ashfield District Council)
- Cllr Murphy (Ashfield District Council)
- Cllr Morrison (Ashfield District Council) – Hucknall Area Committee
- Cllr K Rostance (Ashfield District Council)
- Cllr P Rostance (Ashfield District Council)
- Cllr Rowland (Broxtowe Borough Council)
- Cllr Sanger (Bassetlaw District Council)
- Cllr Smith (Rushcliffe Borough Council)

Parish councillors

- Councillor Fisher (Shelford Parish Council)
- Councillor Foxwell (Oxton Parish Council)
- Councillor Miller (Shelford Parish Council)
- Councillor Greenwood (Cropwell Bishop Parish Council)

Parish and Town Councils

- Balderton Parish Council
- Barton in Fabis Parish Council
- Beckingham cum Saundby Parish Council
- Bestwood St Albans Parish Council
- Brinsley Parish Council
- Burton Joyce Parish Council
- Carlton on Trent Parish Council
- Cauntton Parish Council
- Coddington Parish Council
- Cotgrave Town Council
- Cromwell Parish Meeting
- Cropwell Bishop Parish Council
- East Leake Parish Council
- Egmantton Parish Council
- Gotham Parish Council
- Greasley Parish Council
- Holme Pierrepont & Gamston Parish Council
- Kinoulton Parish Council
- Mattersey Parish Council
- Newark Town Council
- Newton Parish Council
- Nuthall Parish Council
- Oxton Parish Council
- Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council

- Ranskill Parish Council
- Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Meeting
- Shelford Parish Council
- Stapleford Town Council
- Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council
- Thrumpton Parish Meeting
- Tuxford Town Council
- Upton Parish Council
- Walkeringham Parish Council
- West Stockwith Parish Council
- Weston Parish Council

Local organisations

- All Hallows Church
- Beauvale Residents' Association
- Friends of All Hallows
- Friends of Gedling Country Park
- North East Bassetlaw Forum
- Reach Out Residents' Group
- SABRHE
- Village Vision

Residents

- 125 local residents

Petitions

- Keep Hucknall Unique
- Keep Gedling in Gedling

Appendix C

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
------	--