

# Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Nottinghamshire County Council

Electoral review

June 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](mailto: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 draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	7
Draft recommendations	8
Ashfield District	9
Bassetlaw District	12
Broxtowe Borough	15
Gedling Borough	18
Mansfield District	20
Newark & Sherwood District	22
Rushcliffe Borough	26
Conclusions	30
Parish electoral arrangements	30
3 Have your say	33

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council	36
B Submissions received	42
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 provides 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 draft recommendations propose that Nottinghamshire County Council's 66 councillors should represent 48 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions. Only Newstead division (with 11% fewer electors than the average by 2020) would have a variance of greater than 10% from the average for Nottinghamshire by 2020.

**You have until 10 August 2015 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 33 for how to have your say.**

# 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 main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- have regard to the boundaries of district and borough wards in drawing boundaries for county divisions
- ensure that proposed county divisions do not cross external district and borough boundaries
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

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](http://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 a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being 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
10 November 2015	Publication of final recommendations

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 ward 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 ('the 2009 Act').

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 draft recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> 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.

	<b>2014</b>	<b>2020</b>
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 draft recommendations, only Newstead division (with 11% fewer electors than the average by 2020) would have a variance of greater than 10% from the average for Nottinghamshire by 2020. 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 district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Nottinghamshire County or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums 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 and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers 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 draft 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 Both proposals were for council sizes which the Commission would normally consider to be representative of councils similar to Nottinghamshire.

19 While the Council stated that the changes to the Council's governance arrangements and representational role has increased councillors' workload it considered that this has been balanced against the impact of the use of IT in enabling members to effectively undertake their role. The Council maintained that despite increases in member workloads, it will be able to discharge its functions effectively under the existing council size.

20 The Opposition Groups considered that upward growth of electorate in some of the county's districts and changes to the governance arrangements justified an increase in council size. It considered that the impact of IT has not offset the increase in member workloads.

21 In considering the appropriate number of councillors for Nottinghamshire, we examined how a council size of 67 or 71 would be allocated between the seven districts. This indicated that neither a council size of 67 or 71 provided the best allocation of members across the county and that alternative council sizes might provide a better allocation. However, we balanced this against the evidence received for both 67 and 71 elected members. In this context, we considered that the Council's submission for 67 members provided more persuasive evidence than the Opposition Groups. Having considered the evidence the Commission consulted on division arrangements based on a council size of 67 members.

22 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.

23 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.

24 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.

25 A council size of 66 provides the following allocation between the districts in the county:

- Ashfield District – 10 councillors
- Bassetlaw District – nine councillors
- Broxtowe Borough – nine councillors
- Gedling Borough – nine councillors
- Mansfield District – nine councillors
- Newark & Sherwood District – 10 councillors
- Rushcliffe Borough – 10 councillors

## Division patterns

26 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.

27 The Council's county-wide scheme provided a pattern of 44 single-member divisions, 10 two-member divisions and one three-member division for the county. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we are broadly basing our draft recommendations on the Council's proposals, but subject to amendments in all districts. These amendments seek to reflect other comments received, strengthen boundaries and/or further improve levels of electoral equality.

28 Our draft recommendations are for 48 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

29 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on

pages 36–41) and on the large map accompanying this report.

30 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

## Draft recommendations

31 The tables on pages 9–28 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Nottinghamshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Ashfield District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Ashfields	1	-6 %	This division comprises Ashfields, Larwood and Leamington district wards.	<p>The Conservative Group on the Council put forward proposals for this division. However, its proposals for the whole of Ashfield District secured lower levels of coterminosity between divisions and wards than the county-wide proposals. We have therefore decided not to base our recommendations on these proposals.</p> <p>We are adopting the Council's Ashfields division without amendment as it secures good electoral equality and uses clear boundaries.</p>
Hucknall North	1	-6	This division comprises Hucknall North ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	<p>The Council put forward proposals for the retention of the existing three-member Hucknall division. The Conservative Group on the Council objected to this and put forward proposals for single-member divisions. We received some limited support and objections to the three-member division.</p> <p>We considered the proposal for a three-member division, and while we noted that this is the existing division, we had concerns that this would not provide effective and convenient local government, creating a division with over 25,000 electors, albeit served by three councillors. We therefore examined the Conservative Group's proposals, but were concerned that the boundaries of its proposed divisions did not reflect local communities. We therefore drew up our own single-member divisions pattern for the area seeking to reflect where possible the new ward boundaries for Ashfield.</p>

				The Hucknall North division comprises Hucknall North ward and part of Hucknall South ward that has access to Hucknall North via Moor Road.
Hucknall South	1	-9	This division comprises Hucknall Central ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	<p><i>See the argument in the Hucknall North division (above)</i></p> <p>The Hucknall South division comprises part of Hucknall South ward and Hucknall Central division and retains the central area of Hucknall in a single division.</p>
Hucknall West	1	-8	This division comprises Hucknall West ward and part of Hucknall South ward.	<p><i>See the argument in the Hucknall North Division (above)</i></p> <p>The Hucknall West division comprises Hucknall North ward and part of Hucknall South ward. It was necessary to transfer part of Hucknall South ward to the division to secure good electoral equality. The area of Hucknall South ward transferred to the division has road links via Wood Lane to Hucknall West ward.</p>
Kirkby North	1	1%	This division comprises Abbey Hill and Summit wards, and part of Kingsway ward.	<p>The Conservative Group on the Council put forward proposals for this division. However, its proposals for the whole of Ashfield, including this division, secured lower levels of coterminosity than the county-wide proposals and therefore we have decided not to base our recommendations on these proposals.</p> <p>The county-wide submission proposed a Kirkby North division which would have 10% more electors than the county average. We therefore propose an amendment transferring an area to the west of Kingsway from Kirkby North to Kirkby South division. While we note that this worsens coterminosity with the district wards it improves electoral equality in Kirkby North from 10% more electors to 1% more, while worsening it Kirkby South division from 1% fewer to 5% more electors.</p>
Kirkby South	1	5%	This division comprises Annesley & Kirkby	As stated in the Kirkby North section (above), we have rejected the Conservative Group's proposals for this division and

			Woodhouse and Kirkby Cross & Portland ward, and part of Kingsway ward.	propose modifications to the Kirkby North division in order to secure good levels of electoral equality. This has a knock-on effect to this division. However, the modified Kirkby South division still secures a good level of electoral equality.
Selston	1	9%	This division comprises Jacksdale, Selston, and Underwood wards.	There was general agreement over the configuration of this division. While it secures relatively poor levels of electoral equality, it lies at the edge of the district and therefore alternative options are limited. In addition, this division secures good coterminosity. We are therefore including this division in our draft recommendations.
Sutton Central & East	1	-4%	This division comprises Central & New Cross and Sutton Junction & Harlow Wood wards, and part of St Mary's ward.	The county-wide submission proposed a Sutton Central & East division which divides Carsic ward. This area was united under the district review and we do not consider that dividing it at county level would reflect local communities. However, in order to secure good levels of electoral equality it is necessary to divide a district ward in this part of Ashfield. We consider that dividing St Mary's ward around Alfreton Road would have the least impact on local communities and propose this modification as part of our draft recommendations.
Sutton North	1	2%	This division comprises The Dales, Skegby and Stanton Hill & Teversal wards.	Our Sutton North division comprises whole district wards, secures good electoral equality and uses clear boundaries.
Sutton West	1	4%	This division comprises Carsic and Huthwaite & Brierley wards, and part of St Mary's ward.	Our proposed Sutton West division is similar to those proposed during consultation. However, we have proposed different boundaries in order to secure a clearer boundary between our Sutton Central & East and Sutton West divisions and to avoid dividing the Carsic area.

## 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.	<p>We received identical proposals for the Blyth &amp; Harworth division which would be coterminous with district wards.</p> <p>Although this division secures reasonable levels of electoral equality this can be improved by transferring Scrooby parish to the Misterton division. While this worsens coterminosity it improves electoral equality in Misterton division. We also note that Scrooby has good road links to the south to Ranskill.</p>
Misterton	1	-1%	This division comprises Clayworth, Everton, Misterton and Ranskill wards, and Scrooby parish of Blyth ward, Walkeringham parish of Beckingham ward, and Lound and Sutton parishes of Sutton ward.	<p>The Conservative Group put forward proposals for a Misterton division as part of its wider proposals for the Retford area. However, following our tour of the area, we reject its proposal for Retford and consider that the Retford area is best served in divisions that are chiefly urban, rather than the Conservative Group proposal to create rural divisions that incorporate areas of Retford. We therefore have rejected its proposed Misterton division.</p> <p>We propose modifications to the County Council's proposed Misterton division in order to improve electoral equality in its Tuxford division which would have 12% more electors under a 66-member council. We are transferring Walkeringham parish to Misterton division to improve electoral equality in Tuxford division. However, as a result we need to transfer an area of Misterton division to retain good electoral equality in this division. We are therefore transferring Babworth and Barnby Moor parishes to the Retford West division.</p>

				With the addition of Scrooby parish (described in the Blyth & Harworth section) our Misterton division would have 1% fewer electors than the division average by 2020.
Retford East	1	-1%	This division comprises East Retford East and East Retford South wards.	As stated above, following our tour of the area we have rejected the Conservative Group's proposals for the Retford area. We are therefore proposing a Retford East division which comprises whole district wards, has clear boundaries and secures a good level of electoral equality.
Retford West	1	1%	This division comprises East Retford North and East Retford West ward, and Babworth and Barnby Moor parishes of Sutton ward.	As stated in the Misterton section (above) we propose transferring Babworth and Barnby Moor parishes from Misterton division. Although this transfers two rural parishes to the Retford area, they have direct road links and help secure a good level of electoral equality. We considered our Retford West division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
Tuxford	1	3%	This division comprises East Markham, Rampton, Sturton and Tuxford & Trent wards, and Beckingham and Saundby parishes of Beckingham ward.	As discussed in the Misterton area (above) we are also transferring the Walkeringham area from the County Council's proposed Tuxford division to its Misterton division. Although this worsens coterminosity it improves electoral equality. We also note that Walkeringham has good road links into Gringley-on-the-Hill parish in Misterton division. We consider that our Tuxford division provides a good balance between the statutory criteria.
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.	<p>We received different division patterns for the Worksop area. However, we noted that neither set of proposals secured particularly good levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>We therefore explored options to try and improve electoral equality, while using good boundaries.</p> <p>Our Worksop East division would have 4% more electors than the county average by 2020 and have identifiable boundaries.</p>



Worksop North	1	5%	This division comprises Carlton and Worksop North East wards, and part of Worksop North ward.	<p>The patterns of divisions suggested for the Worksop area did not provide for good levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>We therefore explored options to try and improve electoral equality, while using good boundaries.</p> <p>Our Worksop North division would have 5% more electors than the county average by 2020 and have clear boundaries.</p>
Worksop South	1	5%	This division comprises Welbeck and Worksop South wards, and part of Worksop South East ward.	<p>We received different division patterns for the Worksop area. However, we noted that neither set of proposals secured particularly good levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>We therefore explored options to try and improve electoral equality, while using good boundaries.</p> <p>Our Worksop South division would have 5% more electors than the county average by 2020.</p>
Worksop West	1	7%	This division comprises part of Worksop North ward and part of Worksop North West ward.	<p>The patterns of divisions suggested for the Worksop area did not provide for good levels of electoral equality.</p> <p>We therefore explored options to try and improve electoral equality, while using good boundaries and coterminosity.</p> <p>Our Worksop West division would have 7% more electors than the county average by 2020.</p>

## 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.	<p>The County Council's proposed division secured good levels of electoral equality. However, we had concerns about the boundaries and also noted that neighbouring Toton, Chilwell &amp; Attenborough division had relatively poor electoral equality. We therefore propose modifications to the boundaries between this division, Toton, Chilwell &amp; Attenborough and Bramcote &amp; Beeston North divisions to secure stronger boundaries and better electoral equality.</p> <p>We are transferring the area to the east of Holly Lane from Toton, Chilwell &amp; Attenborough division to Beeston Central &amp; Rylands division, and transferring the area to the north of Park Street from Beeston Central &amp; Rylands division to Bramcote &amp; Beeston North division. This worsens electoral equality in Beeston Central &amp; Rylands to 3% fewer electors than the county average, but improves it in the neighbouring Toton, Chilwell &amp; Attenborough division.</p>
Bramcote & Beeston North	1	6%	This division comprises Beeston North ward, part of Beeston West ward, and part of Bramcote ward.	Our Bramcote & Beeston North division includes the area of Beeston Central & Rylands division to the north of Park Street. Our tour of the area confirmed that this area has good links to the area to the north of Beeston Fields Golf Course via Wollaton Road. We consider this division has identifiable boundaries and provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality.
Eastwood & Brinsley	1	5%	This division comprises Brinsley, Eastwood Hall, Eastwood St Mary's wards,	The County Council's proposed Eastwood & Brinsley division would have 13% more electors than the county average under a 66-member council. We did not consider there to be sufficient evidence to justify such poor electoral equality. In addition, its

			<p>and part of Eastwood Hilltop ward.</p>	<p>proposal excluded the area around Coach Drive which only has road access via the division. It also excluded the area around Brunel Avenue which is effectively part of urban the Eastwood area. Both areas were included in the Eastwood Hall ward as part of the recent Broxtowe district electoral review and as such we do not consider that they should be excluded from the Eastwood area for county division purposes. We also note a number of respondents expressed concern about any proposal to divide Greasley parish between divisions, and Brinsley Parish Council's request to be in a rural division.</p> <p>We have therefore explored alternatives. Unfortunately, it has not proved possible to create a division pattern that does not lead to the division of Greasley parish. In addition, we have been unable to create a pattern that secures good electoral equality without requiring the division of Eastwood parish between divisions. Finally, while we acknowledge that Brinsley is a village, our tour of the area confirmed that it has good road links into the north of Eastwood.</p> <p>We are therefore retaining Brinsley in Eastwood &amp; Brinsley division, but also including the area around Coach Drive and Brunel Avenue. As a result, part of Eastwood is transferred to the Kimberley &amp; Giltbrook division, while another area is transferred to the Nuthall &amp; Greasley division. We did consider the creation of a two-member division comprising part of Eastwood and the Kimberley &amp; Giltbrook division, but concluded that this would have a long north-south extent and would still require part of Eastwood to be transferred to the Nuthall &amp; Greasley division. We consider that our Eastwood &amp; Brinsley division provides a good balance between the statutory criteria.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Kimberley & Giltbrook	1	7%	This division comprises Kimberley ward, part of Eastwood Hilltop ward and part of Greasley district ward.	As stated above (Eastwood & Brinsley section) we have had to transfer part of Eastwood parish to the Kimberley & Giltbrook division in order to reflect road links in this part of the county. While this worsens electoral equality for the Kimberley & Giltbrook division, modifications have been required in order to secure a division pattern in Broxtowe Borough with good levels of electoral equality.
Nuthall & Greasley	1	6%	This division comprises Watnall & Nuthall West ward, part of Greasley ward, and part of Nuthall East & Strelley wards.	As stated above (Eastwood & Brinsley section) we have had to transfer part of Eastwood parish to the Nuthall & Greasley division in order to secure a division pattern for the Eastwood and Brinsley area. We acknowledge that this goes against many of the responses that stated that Greasley should not be divided. However, the geography of the area and distribution of electorate means that this is not possible. Our investigations indicated that alternative proposals would not result in a pattern of divisions with good levels of electoral equality.
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	The county-wide proposal was for a two-member Stapleford & Broxtowe Central division. We note that there was limited objection to a two-member division in this part of the county. We did consider whether this division could be divided into two single-member divisions but our investigations suggested this would divide communities. On the basis of the evidence received we propose a two-member Stapleford & Broxtowe Central division as part of our draft 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 Beeston Central & Rylands section, we noted that the proposal received for a Toton, Chilwell & Attenborough division has relatively poor electoral equality. We therefore propose transferring the area to the east of Holly Lane to Beeston Central & Rylands. This improves electoral equality while still using clear boundaries.

## 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.	<p>The county-wide proposal was for a two-member Arnold North division. We note that this proposal did not take into consideration the new district wards that came into effect at the 7 May 2015 elections. In addition, in light of the decision to allocate Gedling nine councillors it has been necessary to redraw the boundaries of this division.</p> <p>We have sought where possible to reflect the new ward boundaries and to propose a pattern of divisions across Gedling Borough that provide good electoral equality. We are therefore transferring an area to the north-east of Somersby Road and the area around Podder Lane to Arnold North division. Finally we are transferring an area around Furlong Street out of the division to Arnold South. These modifications result in our Arnold North division having 4% more electors than the average by 2020.</p>
Arnold South	2	7%	This division comprises Daybrook, Porchester and Woodthorpe wards, part of Ernehale ward, and part of Phoenix wards.	<p>The county-wide proposal was for a two-member Arnold South division. As with the Arnold North division (discussed above), we note that this proposal did not take into consideration the new district wards that came into effect at the 7 May 2015 elections. In addition, in light of the decision to allocate Gedling nine councillors it has been necessary to redraw the boundaries of this division.</p> <p>We have sought where possible to reflect the new ward boundaries to ensure a good level of electoral equality. We are therefore transferring an area around Furlong Street from Arnold North division into Arnold South and an area to the west</p>

				of Perlethorpe Avenue from Carlton West division to Arnold South division. We are also tying the division boundary to the ward boundary between Carlton Hill and Porchester district wards. Finally, we are transferring an area to the north-east of Somersby Road from Arnold South to Arnold North division. We consider that our Arnold South division provides for a reasonable level of electoral equality and follows clear boundaries.
Calverton	1	6%	This division comprises Dumbles ward, part of Calverton ward, and part of Gedling ward.	<p>The County Council's proposed Calverton division comprised Calverton, Lambley and Woodborough parishes and the area of Arnold around Podder Lane.</p> <p>We propose amendments to this division to reflect the changes we have made to Arnold North and Arnold South divisions. As stated above we are retaining the area around Podder Lane in Arnold North division. However, the remainder of the Calverton division requires additional electors to secure good electoral equality. We are therefore transferring an area of Gedling around Willow Park to the Calverton division. We acknowledge that this area is some distance from Calverton, but note that it has good links to Lambley and Woodborough.</p>
Carlton East	1	4%	This division comprises Colwick and Trent Valley wards, part Gedling ward, and part of Netherfield ward.	The county-wide proposal was for a two-member Carlton East division. However, in light of the decision to allocate Gedling nine councillors, we are substantially redrawing the boundaries of this division and allocating it a single councillor. We consider our single-member Carlton East division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
Carlton West	2	6%	This division comprises Carlton, Carlton Hill and Cavendish wards, part of Gedling ward, and part of	<p>The county-wide proposal was for a two-member Carlton West division.</p> <p>In light of the allocation of nine members to Gedling and changes elsewhere in the district, we are proposing</p>

			Netherfield ward, and part of Phoenix district ward.	amendments to the proposed Carlton East division. The Perlethorpe Avenue area is being transferred to Arnold South division, while the area to the south of Arnold Lane in Gedling is being transferred to the Carlton West division. This results in our Carlton West division having reasonable levels of electoral equality and identifiable boundaries.
Newstead	1	-11%	This division comprises Newstead Abbey ward, part of Bestwood St Albans ward, part of Calverton ward, and part of Redhill ward.	<p>The county-wide proposal was for a single-member Newstead division.</p> <p>We note that this division has a relatively poor level of electoral equality, with 11% fewer electors than the county average. We have therefore looked at options to improve this, but have been unable to identify a boundary that would reflect communities. We are therefore adopting Newstead division without amendment.</p>

## 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.	<p>The county-wide scheme proposed the retention of the Mansfield East division. The retention of this division was also supported by Mansfield District Council.</p> <p>This division secures good electoral equality and coterminosity. We are therefore proposing to retain the Mansfield East division as part of our draft recommendations.</p>
Mansfield North	2	-6%	This division comprises Hornby, Manor, Park Hall, Peafields, Sherwood, Woodhouse, Woodlands and Yeoman Hill wards.	The county-wide proposal supported the retention of the existing Mansfield North division. Mansfield District Council requested minor amendments to tie the division boundary to the district ward boundaries. The amendments with Mansfield South address minor boundary anomalies. It proposed a larger

				<p>amendment with Mansfield West Division. These amendments would marginally improve electoral equality in Mansfield North from 7% fewer to 6% fewer electors than the county average by 2020. Having considered the alternative boundaries proposed we have decided to modify the boundaries of the Mansfield North division transferring an area of Bull Farm &amp; Pleasley Hill from Mansfield West division</p>
Mansfield South	2	2%	<p>This division comprises Berry Hill, Carr Bank, Eakring, Kings Walk, Newgate, Oakham, Racecourse and Sandhurst wards, and part of Portland ward.</p>	<p>The county-wide proposals supported the retention of the existing Mansfield North division. Mansfield District Council requested minor amendments to tie the division boundary to the district ward boundaries. The amendments with Mansfield North reflect minor boundary anomalies.</p> <p>Councillors Garner (Mansfield South division) and Sissons (Mansfield South division) highlighted the opposing variances between Mansfield South and Mansfield West division, where, under the current arrangements, they would have 9% more and 7% fewer electors than the county average by 2020, respectively. They therefore argued that part of the Portland district ward around Victoria Street should be transferred from Mansfield South division to Mansfield West.</p> <p>We note the county-wide proposal for the retention of the existing division, but also note that Mansfield District Council wanted to ensure coterminosity between all the district wards and county divisions. While we concur with the desire to achieve good levels of coterminosity, this cannot be done at the expense of good levels of electoral equality, which Councillors Garner and Sissons argued could be improved. If we adopt Mansfield District Council's amendment between Mansfield North and Mansfield West this further worsens electoral</p>



				<p>equality in West Mansfield to 10% fewer electors than the county average by 2020.</p> <p>Therefore, we propose to transfer the area around Victoria Street to Mansfield West division. Our tour of the area confirmed that this is separated from the rest of South Mansfield by the railway line and that it has good road links into West Mansfield. While this worsens coterminosity it improves electoral equality to 2% more electors than the county average by 2020.</p>
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.	<p>The county-wide scheme proposed the retention of the existing Mansfield West division. As discussed in the Mansfield South and Mansfield North sections (above), Mansfield District Council and Councillors Garner and Sissons proposed amendments to this division.</p> <p>We propose amendments to the existing West Mansfield division. The modifications we are making are detailed in the Mansfield South division description. We consider that our Mansfield West division results in good electoral equality and has clear boundaries.</p>
Warsop	1	0%	This division comprises Market Warsop, Meden, Netherfield and Warsop Carrs wards.	The County Council and Mansfield District Council proposed the retention of the existing Warsop division. We are retaining this division as part of the draft recommendations.

### Newark & Sherwood District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Balderton	1	3%	This division comprises Balderton South ward, part of	The county-wide proposal was for a single-member Balderton division. While the level of electoral equality under a 66-

			Balderton North & Coddington ward, and Alverton, Cotham, Fernwood, Kilvington and Staunton parishes of Farndon & Fernwood ward.	<p>member council improves from 10% more electors than the county average in 2020 under a 67-member council to 8% more, we had concerns about the boundaries, particularly the inclusion of the Hawton area in the division, and the associated impact of links with the Council's Farndon &amp; Trent division.</p> <p>We therefore propose an alternative Balderton division which places the southern part of Balderton parish in a division with Alverton, Cotham, Fernwood, Kilvington and Staunton parishes. This division has good north-south links via Grange Lane and secures a good level of electoral equality.</p>
Blidworth	1	-6%	This division comprises Rainworth South & Blidworth ward, Oxtun parish of Dover Beck ward, and Rainworth parish of Rainworth North & Rufford ward.	The county-wide scheme proposed a single-member Blidworth division. Under a 66-member council this division would have 11% fewer electors than the county average by 2020. We therefore sought to improve this by transferring Oxtun parish into the division. The parish has links into Blidworth via Oaks Lane and Haywood Oaks Lane.
Collingham	1	-4%	This division comprises Bridge and Collingham wards.	<p>The county-wide proposal for a Collingham division was almost identical to the existing division, but with the exclusion of a small area around Sleaford Road and Beacon Hill Road.</p> <p>We are proposing amendments to this division, particularly to overcome the creation of a Farndon &amp; Trent division that has no direct road links to the areas either side of the River Trent. In addressing this and the realignment of the Balderton division it has been necessary to make amendments to Collingham. While we note the comments of Coddington and Barnby-in-the Willow parishes about remaining in Collingham division with other rural parishes, this has not been possible while also securing a reasonable level of electoral equality. We are therefore transferring these parishes to Newark East division. The nature and distribution of the electorate means that all the</p>

				Newark divisions, with the exception of Newark West, contain parishes from the surrounding rural area.
Farndon & Trent	1	-5%	This division comprises Castle and Trent wards ,and East Stoke, Elston, Farndon, Hawton, Syerston and Thorpe parishes of Farndon & Fernwood ward.	<p>The county-wide scheme proposed a Farndon &amp; Trent division based on the existing division less the Hawton area which it transferred to its Balderton division. However, we noted that this division does not have direct road links between the areas either side of the River Trent. We have therefore modified the division, taking in part of Newark town covering the Trent Bridge area. In order to secure good electoral equality it has been necessary to make further amendments. We are transferring Bathley, North Muskham and South Muskham parishes to our Muskham &amp; Farnsfield division, which keeps these parishes together in a division.</p> <p>In order to achieve a good level of electoral equality we have also had to include Upton parish in this division. We acknowledge that Upton Parish Council states it has links to Southwell, but retaining the parish in Southwell would create a Farndon &amp; Trent division with 9% fewer electors than the county average by 2020 and a Southwell with 6% more. We do not consider there to be persuasive evidence at this time to support these high opposing variances.</p>
Muskham & Farnsfield	1	7%	This division comprises Farnsfield and Muskham wards, Edingley, Halam, Hockerton, Kirklington and Winkburn parishes of Southwell ward, Carlton-on-Trent, Grassthorne, Kersall, Kneesall, Maplebeck, Ompton, Ossington, Sutton-on-Trent and Weston	Our Muskham & Farnsfield division is different from those proposed. Our division ensures that North Muskham and South Muskham parishes remain in a single division. In addition, the whole of Bilsthorpe parish is in this division. We consider that this division results in a reasonable level of electoral equality and has identifiable boundaries.

			parishes of Sutton-on-Trent ward; and part of Bilsthorpe ward.	
Newark East	1	-1%	This division comprises part of Balderton North & Coddington ward, and part of Beacon ward.	In light of changes to the pattern of divisions across the district we proposed a Newark East division as part of our draft recommendations. As stated above we acknowledge that our Newark East division includes Coddington and Barnby-in-the-Willows parishes despite their request to be in Collingham division. This was necessary to secure good levels of electoral equality. We consider our Newark East division has a good level of electoral equality and has identifiable boundaries.
Newark West	1	-7%	This division comprises Devon ward and part of Beacon ward.	Our proposed Newark West division is a significantly modified version of those proposed in response to the consultation. These modifications have been necessary in order to reflect changes to divisions elsewhere in the district. We consider our Newark West division secures a reasonable level of electoral equality and has identifiable boundaries.
Ollerton	1	4%	This division comprises Boughton and Ollerton ward and Egmanton and Laxton & Moorhouse parishes of Sutton-on-Trent ward.	The county-wide proposal supported the retention of the existing Ollerton division. However, in light the creation of Muskham & Farnsfield division it was necessary to transfer the parishes of Egmanton and Laxton & Moorhouse. We note that these parishes all have direct road links into the division, while securing a good level of electoral equality.
Sherwood Forest	1	-4%	This division comprises Edwinstowe & Clipstone ward; and Eakring; Rufford and Wellow parishes of Rainworth North & Rufford ward; and part of Bilsthorpe district ward.	<p>The county-wide proposal suggested a modification to the existing division, transferring part of Bilsthorpe parish to its Farnsfield &amp; Lowdham division.</p> <p>Our tour of the area confirmed that the suggested split of Bilsthorpe parish was somewhat arbitrary. While this enabled it to secure reasonable electoral equality, we did not consider this to be in the interests of Bilsthorpe parish. We therefore explored alternatives that enable us to retain the whole of</p>

				Bilsthorpe in a single division. We have transferred Bilsthorpe to our Muskham & Farnsfield division, while transferring Wellow parish into Sherwood division. We consider this division provides for a good level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.
Southwell	1	3%	This division comprises Lowdham ward, Caythorpe, Epperstone, Hoveringham, Gonalston, Gunthorpe and Thurgarton parishes of Dover Beck ward, and Halloughton and Southwell parishes of Southwell ward.	This is a significantly modified version of the County Council's proposed Southwell & Cauntton division. This reflects amendments elsewhere, including the inclusion of Bilsthorpe in a division with North Muskham and South Muskham. Our Southwell division places Southwell in a division with parishes to the south-west that are linked along the A612. We acknowledge that Upton Parish Council wished to remain in a division with Southwell; however, as explained above, this has not been possible while retaining good levels of electoral equality. We welcome comments on this configuration during consultation on our draft recommendations.

### Rushcliffe Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Bingham East	1	-4%	This division comprises Bingham East, Cranmer and Thoroton wards, Wiverton Hall parish of Cropwell district ward, and East Bridgford and Kneeton parishes of East Bridgford ward.	<p>We received two sets of division patterns for Rushcliffe district. The county-wide proposals produced poor levels of electoral equality, particularly in the West Bridgford area. The Conservative Group's proposals also produced a number of relatively poor variances. In addition, our tour of the area confirmed that its proposals to transfer part of Ruddington into a West Bridgford division would not reflect communities.</p> <p>We are proposing dividing Bingham between an east and west division. The distribution of the electorate has meant that it is hard to create divisions that secure good levels of electoral</p>

				<p>equality and that use strong boundaries. In this area while it may be possible to create a single-member Bingham division, this leaves the surrounding area with too few electors to create a viable division. We are therefore creating a Bingham East division using the district ward boundaries and combining it with the surrounding rural parishes that have road links into the division. We did consider whether a two-member division based on combining our Bingham East and West divisions could provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. However, we had concerns about the size of the geographical area this division would cover and that this might not provide for effective and convenient local government.</p>
Bingham West	1	-6%	<p>This division comprises Bingham West ward, Cropwell Bishop, Cropwell Butler and Tithby parishes of Cropwell ward, Shelford &amp; Newton parish of East Bridgford ward, Colston Bassett parish and part of Langar Cum Barnstone parish in Nevile &amp; Langer ward.</p>	<p>As stated above, we are proposing dividing Bingham between an east and west division. The distribution of the electorate has meant that it is hard to create divisions that secure good levels of electoral equality and that follow strong boundaries. In this area while it may be possible to create a single-member Bingham division, this leaves the surrounding area with too few electors to create a viable division. We are therefore creating a Bingham West division using the district ward boundaries and combining it with the surrounding rural parishes that have road links into the division.</p>
Keyworth	1	-9%	<p>This division comprises Keyworth &amp; Wolds ward, and Costock, Rempstone, Thorpe in the Glebe and Wysall parishes of Bunny ward, Hickling and Upper Broughton parishes of Neville &amp; Langer ward, and Plumtree parish of Tollerton ward.</p>	<p>We propose a significantly modified Keyworth division to that put forward by respondents. We note that there was support for the retention of the existing division; however, modifications have been necessary to create a division with reasonable electoral equality given the spread of the electorate and local geography.</p>

Radcliffe on Trent	1	1%	This division comprises Gamston North and Radcliffe on Trent wards.	We propose modifications to the proposals put forward for Radcliffe on Trent division. This takes in the Gamston parish area of West Bridgford with the Radcliffe on Trent area, which avoids the need to include surrounding rural parishes.
Ruddington	1	-9%	This division comprises Ruddington ward, Bunny and Bradmore parishes of Bunny ward, and Barton in Fabis; Ratcliffe on Soar and Thurmpton parishes of Gotham ward.	We note that both the division patterns put forward suggested that Barton in Fabis parish be in a division with Ruddington parish, despite having no direct road links within the district. Our tour of the area confirmed that Barton in Fabis has good links via Clifton. Therefore, on balance, we consider that a division containing these parishes would provide the best division pattern in this area. We propose also including Thurmpton and Ratcliffe on Soar, which have direct links into Barton in Fabis via the A453.
Soar Valley	1	-6%	This division comprises Leake and Sutton Bonington wards, and Gotham and Kingston on Soar parishes of Gotham ward.	Our Soar Valley division is based around East Leake. It is comprised of whole parishes, has a reasonable level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.
Tollerton	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.	Our Tollerton division is based around Cotgrave and Tollerton and avoids placing any more rural parishes in a division with West Bridgford. We consider this division has identifiable boundaries.
West Bridgford North	1	3%	This division comprises Lady Bay and Trent Bridge wards, and part of Abbey ward.	Our West Bridgford North division comprises Lady Bay and Trent Bridge district wards and part of Abbey district ward. We consider this division provides for a good level of electoral equality and has clear boundaries.
West Bridgford South	1	3%	This division comprises Edwalton and Gamston	Our West Bridgford South division comprises Edwalton and Gamston South district wards, and parts of Abbey and Musters district wards. This division solely comprises parts of West

			South ward, part of Abbey ward, and Musters ward.	Bridgford, without the need to include any surrounding rural areas. We consider this division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.
West Bridgford West	1	-2%	This division comprises Compton Acres and Lutterell wards, and part of Musters t ward.	Our West Bridgford West division comprises Compton Acres and Lutterell district wards and part of Musters district ward. This division solely comprises parts of West Bridgford, without the need to include any surrounding rural areas. We consider this division provides for a good balance between the statutory criteria.



## Conclusions

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

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	66	66
Number of electoral divisions	57	57
Average number of electors per councillor	9,098	9,670
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	13	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	2	0

### **Draft recommendation**

Nottinghamshire County Council should comprise 66 councillors serving 57 divisions representing 48 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

48 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions.

### **Mapping**

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

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

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, Eastwood, Greasley 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.

**Draft 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 Eastwood parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Eastwood Town Council should return 15 town councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Eastwood Coronation Park (returning four members); Eastwood Dovecote (returning two members); Eastwood Newthorpe Common (returning one member); Eastwood North (returning two members); and Eastwood St Mary's (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

38 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 Greasley parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Greasley Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Greasley (returning two members); Greasley Beauvale (returning two members); Greasley Larkfields (returning one member); Greasley Newthorpe (returning six members); and Greasley Watnall (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

39 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.

**Draft recommendation**

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



### 3 Have your say

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

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

42 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at:  
**[consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)**

43 Submissions can also be made by emailing **[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)** or by writing to:

**Review Officer (Nottinghamshire)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London SW1P 4QP**

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

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

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- 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

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

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?

Effective local government:

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

44 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 in Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

45 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as 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.

46 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.

47 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 next elections for Nottinghamshire Council in 2017.

## Equalities

48 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: Draft 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 %
<b>Ashfield District</b>								
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%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft 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 %
<b>Bassetlaw District</b>								
11	Blyth & Harworth	1	9,359	9,359	3%	10,197	10,197	5%
12	Misterton	1	9,400	9,400	3%	9,561	9,561	-1%
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	9,818	9,818	8%	9,938	9,938	3%
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%
<b>Broxtowe Borough</b>								
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%



**Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
22	Eastwood & Brinsley	1	9,425	9,425	4%	10,121	10,121	5%
23	Kimberley & Giltbrook	1	9,813	9,813	8%	10,370	10,370	7%
24	Nuthall & Greasley	1	9,699	9,699	7%	10,229	10,229	6%
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%
<b>Gedling Borough</b>								
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%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft 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 %
<b>Mansfield District</b>								
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%
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%
<b>Newark &amp; Sherwood District</b>								
38	Balderton	1	7,560	7,560	-17%	9,953	9,953	3%
39	Blidworth	1	8,517	8,517	-6%	9,102	9,102	-6%
40	Collingham	1	9,005	9,005	-1%	9,331	9,331	-4%
41	Farndon & Trent	1	7,786	7,786	-14%	9,139	9,139	-5%
42	Muskham & Farnsfield	1	9,959	9,959	9%	10,311	10,311	7%
43	Newark East	1	7,781	7,781	-14%	9,586	9,586	-1%
44	Newark West	1	8,777	8,777	-4%	9,000	9,000	-7%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
45	Ollerton	1	9,586	9,586	5%	10,013	10,013	4%
46	Sherwood Forest	1	9,030	9,030	-1%	9,290	9,290	-4%
47	Southwell	1	9,821	9,821	8%	9,922	9,922	3%
<b>Rushcliffe Borough</b>								
48	Bingham East	1	9,289	9,289	2%	9,297	9,297	-4%
49	Bingham West	1	6,960	6,960	-24%	9,100	9,100	-6%
50	Keyworth	1	8,642	8,642	-5%	8,754	8,754	-9%
51	Radcliffe on Trent	1	8,463	8,463	-7%	9,761	9,761	1%
52	Ruddington	1	6,858	6,858	-25%	8,791	8,791	-9%
53	Soar Valley	1	8,514	8,514	-6%	9,100	9,100	-6%
54	Tollerton	1	8,095	8,095	-11%	8,888	8,888	-8%
55	West Bridgford North	1	9,939	9,939	9%	9,939	9,939	3%
56	West Bridgford South	1	8,804	8,804	-3%	9,974	9,974	3%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Nottinghamshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2014)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2020)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
57	West Bridgford West	1	9,681	9,681	6%	9,481	9,481	-2%
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>600,474</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>638,195</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>9,098</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>9,670</b>	<b>–</b>

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 ward varies from the average for the district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

# Appendix B

## 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 authority

- Nottinghamshire County Council

### District and borough councils

- Broxtowe Borough Council
- Mansfield District Council

### County councillors

- Councillors Garner and Sissons
- Councillors Grice, Wilkinson & Wilmott
- Councillor Handley
- Councillor Heptinstall
- Councillor Owen
- Councillor Peck
- Councillor Rigby
- Councillor Skelding

### District councillors

- Councillor Brown, Broxtowe Borough Council
- Councillor Handley, Broxtowe Borough Council
- Councillor Rowland, Broxtowe Borough Council

### Political Parties

- Ashfield District Council Labour Group
- Hucknall Branch Labour Party
- Nottinghamshire County Council Conservative Group
- Rushcliffe Constituency Labour Party
- UKIP Gedling

### Parish and town councils

- Barnby-in the-Willows-parish Council
- Brinsley Parish Council
- Caunton Parish Council
- Coddington Parish Council
- Collingham Parish Council
- Cromwell Parish Meeting

- East Leake Parish Council
- East Stoke with Thorpe Parish Council
- Greasley Parish Council
- Kinoulton Parish Council
- Mattersey Parish Council
- Nether Langwith Parish Council
- Newstead Parish Council
- North Muskham Parish council
- Norwell Parish Council
- Nuthall Parish Council
- Papplewick Parish Council
- Rolleston Parish Council
- Selston Parish Council
- South Muskham & Little Carlton Parish Council
- Southwell Town Council
- Styrrup with Oldcotes Parish Council
- Upton Parish Council

#### **Parish councillors**

- Councillor Barson, Brinsley Parish Council
- Councillor Wakeling, Brinsley Parish Council
- 

#### **Residents**

- 18 residents

#### **Local groups**

- Save Brinsley's Heritage & Environment

## 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 <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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