

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Kent County Council

Electoral review

January 2016

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 2016

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	6
Further limited consultation	7
Final recommendations	7
Detailed divisions	8
Ashford Borough	8
Canterbury City	11
Dartford Borough	15
Dover District	16
Gravesham Borough	19
Maidstone Borough	21
Sevenoaks District	23
Shepway District	26
Swale Borough	28
Thanet District	30
Tonbridge & Malling Borough	31
Tunbridge Wells Borough	33
Conclusions	35
Parish electoral arrangements	35
3 What Happens Next?	37
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Kent County Council	38
B Submissions received	46
C Glossary and abbreviations	50

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 Kent?

We are conducting an electoral review of Kent 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 Kent. Overall, 31% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%; Romney Marsh has a variance of +38%.

Our proposals for Kent

Kent County Council currently has 84 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a decrease in council size by three members to 81 councillors will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our final recommendations propose that Kent County Council's 81 councillors should represent 63 single-member divisions and nine two-member divisions. Two of our proposed 72 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Kent by 2021.

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

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Kent County 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 inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation: firstly on division patterns for the Council 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
18 November 2014	Council size decision
9 December 2014	Division pattern consultation
12 May 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
7 July 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
29 September 2015	Further limited consultation
26 January 2016	Publication of final recommendations

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

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

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:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ 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	2021
Electorate of Kent County	1,092,651	1,157,965
Number of councillors	81	81
Average number of electors per councillor	13,490	14,296

10 Under our final recommendations, two of our proposed divisions (Gravesham Rural and Swale East) will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Kent.

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 Kent 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

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

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

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5.9% to 2021.

15 The highest proportion of this growth across the county is expected in the borough of Dartford. Dover is also projected to see substantial growth over the next five years. As a result of the submissions received we have queried and received updated electorate figures for Shepway District. The revised forecast is for 622 more electors than were shown in the initial forecast.

16 Having considered the further 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. Given that we have undertaken a period of further limited consultation in the Sevenoaks area, the publication of these final recommendations has been postponed until 2016. In light of this, the forecast needs to be for 2021 rather than 2020. We are content that the original figures can reasonably be regarded as an accurate reflection of forecast growth to 2021 and have referred to them as such in this report.

Council size

17 Kent County Council submitted a proposal to retain the council size of 84. We carefully considered the representation received. We considered that the Council's submission proposing a council of 84 members was not supported by adequate evidence to justify a council size out of range when compared with its nearest statistical neighbour authorities. We considered that a council size of 81 members was appropriate based on the evidence received and that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively and ensure effective representation of local residents under this council size. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 81.

18 We received two submissions concerning council size in response to the consultation on division patterns. One did not support a reduction in size and the other supported splitting the Council into two councils of 42 members each. We received no other comments. We were not persuaded by the evidence received to change our decision and we therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 81 elected members.

19 In response to the consultation on draft recommendations we received no submissions in relation to council size. We considered that persuasive evidence was not received to modify the proposed council size of 81. We therefore confirm a council size of 81 members for Kent County Council as part of our final recommendations.

20 A council size of 81 provides the following allocation between the district and borough councils in the county. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of district and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions.

We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Ashford District – seven councillors (86%)
- Canterbury City – eight councillors (76%)
- Dartford Borough – six councillors (100%)
- Dover District – seven councillors (90%)
- Gravesham Borough – five councillors (94%)
- Maidstone Borough – nine councillors (85%)
- Sevenoaks District – six councillors (92%)
- Shepway District – six councillors (77%)
- Swale Borough – seven councillors (100%)
- Thanet District – seven councillors (96%)
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough – seven councillors (92%)
- Tunbridge Wells Borough – six councillors (95%)

Division patterns

21 During consultation on division patterns, we received 59 submissions, including a county-wide proposal from Kent County Council. We also received a scheme from the Labour Group on Kent County Council for Dover, Gravesham, Shepway, Swale and Thanet, the areas where they disagreed with the Council's scheme. We received a scheme from Canterbury & Coastal Liberal Democrats for Canterbury and from the UKIP Group for Swale. We received a scheme for Sevenoaks from a local resident and a scheme for Dartford from a local resident. The scheme in Dartford matched that of the Council scheme. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular districts.

22 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions in the Council's submission resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. We based our proposals for Ashford, Canterbury, Dartford, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Shepway, Tonbridge & Malling and Tunbridge Wells on these proposals. However, we made modifications in some areas to minimise electoral variances and ensure more identifiable boundaries.

23 In Dover, Swale and Thanet we based our recommendations on the Labour Group proposals with some modifications to ensure our recommendations provide a good reflection of our statutory criteria. We also based some of our proposals for Swale on the submission from UKIP. In Gravesham, we were unable to base our recommendations on any of the submitted schemes as they all would result in either poor electoral equality or would not follow clearly identifiable boundaries. Therefore, in Gravesham we put forward our own division arrangements.

24 We carefully considered each of the proposals received and visited Kent in order to observe the proposed division boundaries on the ground. Our draft recommendations were for 65 single-member divisions and eight two-member divisions. We considered that our draft recommendations provided good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

Draft recommendations

25 We received 157 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. The submissions received were in relation to our proposals for all the areas of Kent except Maidstone.

26 Having considered the evidence gathered during the consultation on our draft recommendations, we have decided to make changes to all districts except Canterbury, Dartford, Dover, Maidstone and Tunbridge Wells. We consider that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

Further limited consultation

27 During the draft recommendations consultation we received an alternative pattern of divisions for Sevenoaks district from Sevenoaks District Council. The Commission decided to carry out a further limited consultation on this proposal.

28 During this consultation we received 16 further submissions. There was broad support for these proposals which included Swanley Village in a division with the parishes of Darent Valley rather than with the town of Swanley. There was also support for a single division to cover Sevenoaks Town and for the parish of Westerham to be included in a division with the parishes to its east rather than to its south. Given this we have decided to modify our draft recommendations and base our final recommendations on the alternative proposals consulted on.

Final recommendations

29 The tables on pages 8–34 detail our final recommendations for each district in Kent. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Ashford Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Ashford Central	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Bybrook, Barrow Hill and Godinton Park.	We received a submission from a community group suggesting we use the railway line through the centre of town as the southern boundary of the Ashford Central division. We were unable to accede to this due to the high variances it would produce elsewhere in the town. We were also asked to consider changing the boundary between Ashford Central and Ashford Rural West as the result of an ongoing Community Governance Review (CGR). However, as the CGR is ongoing we are unable to consider any changes that could result from it until the CGR has been concluded and the relevant Order made.
Ashford East	1	0%	This division includes the unparished areas of Willesborough and South Willesborough, and part of Sevington parish.	We received no submissions for this part of Ashford borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Ashford Rural East	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Aldington, Bonnington, Brook, Chilham, Crundale, Godmersham, Hastingleigh, Mersham, Molash, Smeeth and Wye with Hinxhill and part of Sevington parish. It also includes the unparished area of Kennington.	
Ashford Rural South	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Bilsington, Kingsnorth, Orlestone,	

			Ruckinge, Shadoxhurst, Warehorne and Woodchurch.	
Ashford Rural West	1	-7%	This division includes the parishes of Bethersden, Boughton Aluph, Challock, Charing, Eastwell, Egerton, Hothfield, Little Chart, Pluckley, Smarden and Westwell. It also includes part of the parish of Great Chart with Singleton, and a small part of the unparished area of Goat Lees.	During the consultation on our draft recommendations we received a submission from Smarden Parish Council objecting to their inclusion in Tenterden division. They confirmed their close community links to the neighbouring parish of Egerton and suggested that the parish of High Halden had much closer community ties to Tenterden and would be a more appropriate parish to include in a Tenterden division. Having considered the evidence received against our statutory criteria we propose that Smarden parish be included in our Ashford Rural West division as part of our final recommendations.
Ashford South	1	5%	This division includes the unparished area of South Ashford and Ashford town centre as well as the parish of Stanhope and part of the parish of Great Chart with Singleton.	The aforementioned submission from a community group also suggested we use the railway line south out of the town as the boundary for Ashford South. We were unable to do this as the knock-on effect it would have in Ashford East would produce unacceptable levels of electoral equality. We have therefore decided to confirm our Ashford South division as final.
Tenterden	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Appledore, Biddenden, High Halden Kenardington, Newenden, Rolvenden, Stone-cum-Ebony, Tenterden and Wittersham.	As mentioned above we intend to include the parish of Smarden in Ashford Rural West and the parish of High Halden in the Tenterden division. We consider that the evidence received indicated that High Halden has better community links with

				Tenterden than Smarden parish has and we consider that this better reflects our statutory criteria.
--	--	--	--	---

Canterbury City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Canterbury City North	1	6%	This division is made up of the unparished areas of Canterbury that make up the City Council wards of Northgate and St Stephen's and parts of Westgate and Blean Forest wards.	We received nine submissions about Canterbury. One submission from a local councillor suggested two different divisions for Canterbury. We have not been able to include these alternative proposals in our final recommendations as doing so would result in poor levels of electoral equality in the district.
Canterbury City South	1	3%	This division is made up of the unparished areas of Canterbury that make up the City Council ward of Barton and parts of the Westgate and Wincheap wards.	<p>We received two other submissions: one from a local political group and the other from a local organisation.</p> <p>The local organisation proposed a two-member division for Canterbury consisting of the four current district wards that cover the city less the parish of Thanington Without.</p> <p>The other submission from a local political group proposed two Canterbury City divisions that differed from our draft recommendations in a number of ways. However, for the reasons discussed below we were unable to recommend this scheme as we did not consider it better represented the statutory criteria when compared with the draft recommendations.</p>

Canterbury North	1	8%	<p>This division includes the parishes of Chestfield, Hackington, Harbledown & Rough Common and St Cosmus & St Damian in the Blean. It also includes parts of the parish of Chartham and the unparished area around the University of Kent at Canterbury, and South Street near Whitstable.</p>	<p>The submission from the political party proposed a Canterbury Rural North division that stretched from Blean in the west to Chislet in the east of the district.</p> <p>We did not consider that this division better reflected the statutory criteria as the division did not have full internal access, meaning that any representative of this division would have to leave the division to reach the rest of this division.</p> <p>We considered that this did not reflect the criteria of convenient and effective local government.</p> <p>We also did not consider that we had received persuasive evidence of the community identity in this area to justify this division and a new division pattern across all of the district.</p> <p>Our proposed Canterbury North division was supported by Harbledown and Rough Common Parish Council. This proposed division was also included in the submission from a local organisation and a local resident.</p> <p>Having considered the evidence received we have decided to confirm our Canterbury North division as final.</p>
-------------------------	---	----	---	--

Canterbury South	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of Adisham, Barham, Bekesbourne-with-Patrixbourne, Bishopsbourne, Bridge, Ickham & Well, Kingston, Littlebourne, Lower Hardres, Petham, Thanington Without, Upper Hardres, Waltham, Wickhambreaux and Womenswold. It also includes part of the parish of Chartham and a small unparished area of South Canterbury.	<p>We received several submissions regarding the inclusion of Fordwich in this division. According to submissions not including Fordwich in a division with Sturry would break strong community ties.</p> <p>The three alternatives schemes received included Fordwich in the proposed Canterbury Rural North division discussed above. For the reasons detailed we have not proposed this division as part of our final recommendations.</p> <p>However, we have decided to include Fordwich in a Herne Village & Sturry division which would produce a variance of -9% for the Canterbury South division and 10% for Herne Village & Sturry.</p>
Herne Bay East	1	2%	This division is made up of the majority of eastern and central Herne Bay and Beltinge.	<p>We received three alternative schemes for Herne Bay. One proposed a single-member Herne Bay division and paired Herne Village with Reculver. The other two proposed a two-member Herne Bay division that included Herne Bay, Herne Village and Reculver. As mentioned above, we did not consider that a persuasive community identity argument has been made to put forward an alternative division pattern across all of the district. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final subject to the modification to include Fordwich parish in</p>
Herne Village & Sturry	1	10%	This division includes the parishes of Chislet, Fordwich, Herne & Broomfield, Hoath, Westbere and Sturry. It also includes the unparished areas of Hillborough, Bishopstone and Reculver.	

				our Herne Village & Sturry division.
Whitstable East & Herne Bay West	1	1%	This division includes the unparished areas of Tankerton, Swalecliffe and Greenhill.	We received a submission from a local councillor that Whitstable should be a two-member division based on the current Canterbury City wards. We are unable to propose this division as it would result in divisions in other parts of the district with unacceptably high variances.
Whitstable West	1	6%	This division includes the unparished areas of central Whitstable and Seasalter.	We also do not propose any of the three alternative schemes for Whitstable as part of our final recommendations. Proposing any of these alternative division patterns for the Whitstable area would have required changes to all of the divisions across Canterbury district. We do not consider that persuasive evidence was received to modify the entire division pattern. We therefore confirm our Whitstable West division as final.

Dartford Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Dartford East	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Hesketh and the Fleet Estate as well as parts of the parishes of Stone and Darenth.	We received no submissions for this part of Dartford borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Dartford North East	1	3%	This division includes the unparished areas of Temple Hill and New Town, and the Milestone area of Stone parish.	
Dartford Rural	1	-4%	This division includes the parishes of Bean, Longfield & New Barn, Southfleet and Sutton-at-Hone & Hawley. It also includes part of the parish of Darenth.	We received one submission from Southfleet Parish Council who fully supported the proposals for Dartford. We therefore confirm this division as final.
Dartford West	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Dartford Town Centre and Bowmans.	We received no submissions for this part of Dartford borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Swanscombe & Greenhithe	1	7%	This division includes the parish of Swanscombe & Greenhithe.	We received a submission from the Town Council reiterating their earlier submission regarding the growth in Swanscombe and Greenhithe. We remain of the view that the correct number of councillors have been allocated to Dartford borough. We therefore confirm our Swanscombe & Greenhithe division as final.
Wilmington	1	-3%	This division includes the parish of Wilmington as well as the unparished areas of Brooklands, Maypole and Joydens Wood.	We received no submissions for this part of Dartford borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Dover District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Deal & Walmer	2	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Deal, Sholden and Walmer.	<p>We received five submissions regarding Deal. A local resident and a political organisation supported the proposal for Deal. Sholden Parish Council fully supported their inclusion in the division of Deal.</p> <p>Dover District Council suggested that our two-member Deal division be split into two single-member divisions using the railway line through the town as the boundary. We note that this splits the parish of Deal between divisions and also creates a division in which there is not full internal access to some residents of Sholden parish.</p> <p>For that reason we consider that the two-member division recommended in the draft recommendations remains the best balance of the statutory criteria. We do, however, propose to modify the name of the division. Walmer Parish Council suggested that the division be renamed Deal & Walmer as a recognition that Walmer forms part of the division. We have decided to include this division name as part of our final recommendations.</p>

Dover North	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Aylesham, Great Mongeham, Guston, Langdon, Nonington, Northbourne, Ringwould with Kingsdown, Ripple, St Margaret's at Cliffe, Sutton and Tilmanstone.	We received no submissions for this part of Dover and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Dover Town	2	-7%	This division includes the parishes of Dover and River.	We received two submissions with suggestions for our Dover Town and Dover West divisions. A submission from a political party suggested that we include the parish of Whitfield in a Dover Town division and include the parish of River in a Dover West division. We do not consider this proposal would provide for electoral equality as it would result in our Dover West division having an unacceptably high variance of -16%. Dover District Council suggested that Dover Town should be divided into two single-member divisions. Whilst their proposed division had an acceptable level of variance, their proposed Dover Urban West division did not have full internal access and we consider that this did not reflect the criteria of convenient and effective local government. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for Dover Town and Dover West as final.
Dover West	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne, Denton with Wootton, Eythorne, Hougham Without, Lydden, Shepherdsweil with Coldred, Temple Ewell and Whitfield.	

Sandwich	1	2%	This division includes the parishes of Ash, Eastry, Goodnestone, Preston, Sandwich, Staple, Stourmouth, Wingham, Woodnesborough and Worth.	We received no submissions for this part of Dover and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
-----------------	---	----	--	--

Gravesham Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Gravesend East	2	5%	This division includes the eastern part of Gravesend and part of the parish of Shorne.	In response to consultation on division patterns we did not consider that the division arrangements suggested provided for reasonable levels of electoral equality.
Gravesham Rural	1	14%	This division includes the parishes of Cobham, Luddesdown, Meopham and Vigo, part of the parish of Shorne and the unparished areas of Istead Rise.	Our draft recommendations for Gravesham were therefore based on a scheme which we had proposed in order to secure reasonable levels of electoral equality.
Northfleet & Gravesend West	2	5%	This division includes the unparished areas of Northfleet and the western part of Gravesend.	<p>We received a number of responses to our consultation on draft recommendations regarding splitting the parish of Shorne between our proposed Gravesend North and Gravesham Rural divisions.</p> <p>As a result of the submissions received we have considered that the draft recommendations are not the best reflection of its statutory criteria. As a result we propose that Gravesham be represented by three divisions. Two of these divisions will elect two members and will cover the urban areas of Gravesend and Northfleet.</p> <p>The third division will be named Gravesham Rural and will cover the rural parishes and</p>

				<p>the unparished area of Istead Rise. A small part of Shorne parish is included in Gravesend East as we consider that this is made up of overspill from Gravesend and shares its community ties with Gravesend.</p> <p>Although this division has a variance of 14% we consider that this reflects the evidence of community identity received.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Maidstone Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Maidstone Central	2	-1%	This division includes the centre of Maidstone including the areas of Allington, Barming Heath, Cherry Orchard and Upper Fant.	We received no submissions for the borough of Maidstone and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Maidstone North East	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Boxley Road, Penenden Heath, Ringlestone and Vinters Park. It also includes a small part of the parish of Boxley.	
Maidstone Rural East	1	1%	This division includes the parishes of Bicknor, Boughton Malherbe, Broomfield & Kingswood, Detling, East Sutton, Frinsted, Harrietsham, Headcorn, Hollingbourne, Hucking, Lenham, Otterden, Stockbury, Thurnham, Ulcombe, Wichling and Wormshill.	
Maidstone Rural North	1	6%	This division includes the parishes of Bearsted and Bredhurst, the vast majority of the parish of Boxley and a small unparished area of Maidstone.	
Maidstone Rural South	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Chart Sutton, Collier Street, Langley, Marden, Staplehurst and Sutton Valence and part of the parish of Boughton Monchelsea.	

Maidstone Rural West	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Barming, Coxheath, East Farleigh, Hunton, Linton, Loose, Nettlestead, Teston, West Farleigh and Yalding.	
Maidstone South	1	3%	This division includes the unparished areas of North Loose and Shepway North and the parish of Tovil.	
Maidstone South East	1	-4%	This division includes the unparished areas of Shepway South and Parkwood, the parishes of Downswood, Leeds and Otham and part of the parish of Boughton Monchelsea.	

Sevenoaks District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Sevenoaks North & Darent Valley	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of Crockenhill, Eynsford, Farningham, Horton Kirby & South Darent, Kemsing, Otford, Seal and Shoreham and part of the parish of Swanley.	We received a number of submissions regarding which parishes should be included in the Darent Valley division. We also received a number of comments about our proposal not to include Swanley Village in this division. The alternative pattern submitted by the District Council includes Swanley Village in this division and was well supported during further limited consultation. We consider that this division provides the best balance of the statutory criteria. A number of submissions suggested that this division should be called Sevenoaks North & Darent Valley rather than Sevenoaks East & Darent Valley as proposed by the Council and the Commission recommends that the division is named Sevenoaks North & Darent Valley.
Sevenoaks Rural North East	1	-1%	This division includes the parishes of Ash-cum-Ridley, Fawkham, Hartley and West Kingsdown.	We received no comments regarding this division which was the same in both our draft recommendations and in the District Council's alternative scheme.
Sevenoaks Rural South	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of Chiddingstone, Cowden, Edenbridge, Hever, Leigh, Penshurst and Sevenoaks Weald.	We received significant, well-evidenced opposition to our proposal to include the parish of Westerham in this division. The alternative scheme submitted by the Council proposed to include Sevenoaks

				Weald parish rather than Westerham parish in this division. This proposal was well-supported and we consider this division provides the best reflection of our statutory criteria.
Sevenoaks Town	1	3%	This division consists of the parish of Sevenoaks and includes all of the town of Sevenoaks.	We received opposition to our proposal to split the town of Sevenoaks between two divisions. The alternative proposal submitted by the Council suggested a division made up entirely of the area covered by Sevenoaks Town Council. This division was well-supported during the further limited consultation and we consider it will provide for effective and convenient local government because it does not split the town between divisions.
Sevenoaks West	1	6%	This division includes the parishes of Badgers Mount, Brasted, Chevening, Dunton Green, Halstead, Knockholt, Riverhead, Sundridge with Ide Hill and Westerham.	Our proposal to exclude Westerham parish from this division created significant opposition. The proposal from the Council includes the parishes Badgers Mount, Dunton Green, Halstead and Knockholt in this division. This was opposed by Badgers Mount Parish Council who wished to remain in a division with Shoreham parish. However, this would create a division with an unacceptably high electoral variance and we are unable to recommend this. We consider that the proposed division best meets our statutory criteria.
Swanley	1	8%	This division includes the parish of Hextable and part of the parish of	This division is as put forward in our draft recommendations with the exception of Swanley Village that we include in the

			Swanley including Swanley town centre.	division of Sevenoaks North & Darent Valley on the basis of the evidence we have received.
--	--	--	--	--

Shepway District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Cheriton, Sandgate & Hythe East	1	8%	This division includes the parished area of Cheriton, the parishes of Saltwood and Sandgate and the eastern part of the parish of Hythe.	We received several submissions objecting to the splitting of Hythe between divisions but no submission suggested an alternative. Shepway District Council were supportive of our proposed boundaries for the whole district and in the absence of any suitable alternatives we confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Elham Valley	1	2%	This division includes the parishes of Acrise, Elham, Elmsted, Hawkinge, Lyminge, Monks Horton, Newington, Paddlesworth, Postling, Sellindge, Stanford, Stelling Minnis, Stowting and Swingfield.	We received one submission regarding the Elham Valley division aside from the District Council submission. Lyminge Parish Council supported this division. We therefore confirm our Elham Valley division as final.
Folkestone East	1	-6%	This division includes the parished areas of East Folkestone around the Canterbury and Dover roads and East Cliff.	As mentioned in paragraph 15 we have received revised electorate figures for the Shorncliffe Garrison area from Shepway District Council. These revised figures make no difference to the variances for the divisions in Folkestone. We received no other comments on the divisions in Folkestone and we confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Folkestone West	1	-3%	This division includes the parished areas of West Folkestone and Morehall.	
Hythe West	1	-4%	This division includes the western part of Hythe parish and the parishes of Dymchurch and Lympe.	As mentioned above we received several objections to the splitting of Hythe but no suitable alternatives so we confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Romney Marsh	1	7%	This division includes the parishes of Brenzett, Brookland, Burmarsh, Ivychurch, Lydd, New Romney, Newchurch, Old Romney, Snargate and St Mary in the Marsh.	<p>We received several submissions for Romney Marsh. Burmarsh, Newchurch and St Mary in the Marsh parish councils. All objected to their parishes being included, either partly or wholly in Hythe West division.</p> <p>Burmarsh Parish Council suggested that all three parishes could be included in a Romney Marsh division that still had an acceptable variance. Whilst it was preferable that Dymchurch parish also be included in Romney Marsh it was accepted that this was not possible as this would not provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality. Burmarsh Parish Council also indicated that Dymchurch had good transport links to Hythe. Dymchurch Parish Council objected to their inclusion in Hythe West but did not suggest an appropriate alternative.</p> <p>Having considered the submissions received, we have decided to include the parishes of Burmarsh, Newchurch and St Mary in the Marsh in our Romney Marsh division.</p>
---------------------	---	----	--	---

Swale Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Faversham	1	6%	This division includes the parished town of Faversham.	<p>We received many submissions regarding the division of Faversham including from Helen Whately MP, two local political parties, The Faverham Society, local councillors and a number of local residents.</p> <p>One political party and its councillors were in favour of the division. The remainder of the submissions opposed the division of Faversham and provided persuasive evidence based on the criteria of community identity and convenient and effective local government. Having considered the submissions received we consider that a single-member Faversham division based on the boundaries of Faversham Town provides a better balance of the statutory criteria and have included this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Sheppey	2	6%	This division includes the parishes of Eastchurch, Leysdown-on-Sea, Minster, Queenborough and Warden and the unparished area of Sheerness.	Both Swale Borough Council and a local political party supported our decision to create a two-member Sheppey division. Two local residents opposed the creation of a two-member division but did not provide persuasive evidence as to why two single-member divisions better represented our

				statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our two-member Sheppey division as final.
Sittingbourne North	1	1%	This division includes the unparished area of Sittingbourne to the north of the A2.	We received no submissions for this part of Swale Borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Sittingbourne South	1	-2%	This division includes all of Sittingbourne south of the A2 and a part of the parish of Tunstall.	
Swale East	1	-11%	This division includes the parishes of Badlesmere, Bapchild, Boughton under Blean, Bredgar, Dunkirk, Doddington, Eastling, Graveney with Goodnestone, Hernhill, Leaveland, Luddenham, Lynsted with Kingsdown, Milstead Newnham, Norton, Buckland & Stone, Oare, Ospringe, Rodmersham, Selling, Sheldwich, Stalisfield, Teynham and Tonge.	As a result of our modifications in the Faversham area, we propose a division that encompasses the rest of our proposed Mid Swale and Swale East divisions. We note that this division will have variance of -11% and consider this will best reflect the statutory criteria.
Swale West	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of Bobbing, Borden, Hartlip, Iwade, Lower Halstow, Newington and Upchurch and the unparished areas of Grove Park and The Meads.	We received no submissions for this part of Swale borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Thanet District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Birchington & Rural	2	-3%	This division includes the parish of Acol, Birchington, Manston, Minster, Monkton, Sarre and St Nicholas at Wade. It also includes the unparished areas of Garlinge, Westbrook and Westgate-on-Sea.	We received 15 submissions for Thanet from 14 local residents and Thanet District Council. Almost all supported the proposed divisions in their entirety with the exception of the District Council who objected to the inclusion of Cliffsend parish in this division. It stated that its community ties are with Ramsgate. On that basis we recommend that Cliffsend parish is included in our Ramsgate division as part of the final recommendations.
Broadstairs	1	4%	This division includes part of the parish of Broadstairs and St Peter's.	We received no submissions for this part of Thanet District and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Cliftonville	1	-4%	This division includes the unparished area of Cliftonville and part of the parish of Broadstairs and St Peter's.	One submission from a local resident asked that we consider using Zion Place and Dane Hill as the boundary between our Cliftonville and Margate divisions. We are unable to do this as such a proposal would leave an unacceptably high variance in the Margate division. We therefore confirm these divisions as final.
Margate	1	0%	This division includes the unparished areas of Central and South Margate.	
Ramsgate	2	8%	This division includes the parishes of Cliffsend and Ramsgate.	As mentioned above we include Cliffsend parish in this division to take account of the community identity evidence we received. Subject to this, we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Tonbridge & Malling Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Malling Central	1	-7%	This division includes the parishes of West Malling and East Malling & Larkfield.	<p>The draft recommendations for this division and Malling North East split the parish of Ditton between divisions as a result of a development that has occurred since the last review of Kent County Council that splits the parish of East Malling & Larkfield.</p> <p>We proposed to include part of the parish of Ditton in this division which had some local support. In response to the draft recommendations we received submissions from Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council and a local MP that objected to the division. The Borough Council does not believe that it represents convenient and effective local government to create a parish ward in Ditton when keeping the whole of Ditton parish within one electoral division still results in acceptable electoral equality. As a result of the submission received we have decided to include all of Ditton parish in our Malling North East division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Malling North	1	0%	This division includes the parishes of Addington, Birling, Leybourne, Offham, Ryarsh, Snodland and Trottiscliffe.	We received submissions from Addington and Trottiscliffe parishes stating that they did not believe that they should be in the same division as Snodland. Neither parish suggested an alternative and to exclude

				them from this division would result in an unacceptable electoral variance. We therefore propose no changes to this division and confirm it as final.
Malling North East	1	6%	This division includes the parishes of Aylesford, Burham, Ditton and Wouldham.	As mentioned above, we have decided to include all of the parish of Ditton in this division on the basis of evidence received. We consider this better reflects community identity.
Malling Rural East	1	2%	This division includes East Peckham, Hadlow, Kings Hill, Mereworth, Wateringbury and West Peckham.	We received no submissions for this part of Tonbridge & Malling borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.
Malling West	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Borough Green, Hildenborough, Ightham, Platt, Plaxtol, Shipbourne, Stansted and Wrotham.	The submission from the Borough Council supported the inclusion of Stansted parish in this division. We therefore confirm our Malling West division as final.
Tonbridge	2	-4%	This division includes the unparished area of Tonbridge.	We received no submissions for this part of Tonbridge & Malling borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.

Tunbridge Wells Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Cranbrook	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Benenden, Cranbrook & Sissinghurst, Frittenden, Goudhurst, Hawkhurst and Sandhurst.	<p>We received a submission from Tunbridge Wells Borough Council that supported the proposals for the borough. The proposed Cranbrook division was also supported by Cranbrook & Sissinghurst Parish Council. A local councillor did not support the proposal for Cranbrook division to include the parish of Goudhurst and suggested instead it encompass the southern part of the town of Staplehurst.</p> <p>We are unable to do this as Staplehurst is not within Tunbridge Wells borough and we are not able to propose divisions that cross district council boundaries. We therefore confirm our Cranbrook division as final.</p>
Tunbridge Wells East	1	-8%	This division includes the unparished area of Sherwood and the parish of Pembury.	<p>Aside from the Council's submission we received no submissions for this part of Tunbridge Wells borough and we therefore confirm our draft recommendations as final.</p>
Tunbridge Wells North	1	-7%	This division includes the unparished area of St John's and the parish of Southborough.	
Tunbridge Wells Rural	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Brenchley, Capel, Horsmonden, Lamberhurst and Paddock Wood.	
Tunbridge Wells South	1	2%	This division includes the unparished area of Tunbridge Wells South.	

Tunbridge Wells West	1	-1%	This division includes the unparished area of Mount Ephraim and west Tunbridge Wells. It also includes the parishes of Bidborough, Rusthall and Speldhurst.	
-----------------------------	---	-----	---	--

Conclusions

30 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2014	2021
Number of councillors	81	81
Number of electoral divisions	72	72
Average number of electors per councillor	13,490	14,296
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Final recommendations

Kent County Council should comprise 81 councillors serving 63 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.

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Kent.

You can also view our final recommendations for Kent on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

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

32 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 city, district and borough councils in Kent 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.

33 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Chartham Parish in Canterbury City.

Final recommendation

Chartham Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chartham & Chartham Hatch (returning seven members) and St Augustine's (returning four members).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

34 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Shorne Parish in Gravesham Borough.

Final recommendation

Shorne Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Shorne West (returning three members) and Shorne Village (returning six members).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

35 As result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Folkestone in Shepway District.

Final recommendation

Folkestone Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, the same as at present, representing seven wards: Broadmead (returning two members), Central (returning four members), Cheriton East (returning one member), Cheriton West (returning three members), East Folkestone (returning four members), Harbour (returning three members) and Harvey West (returning one member).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

36 We have now completed our review of Kent 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

37 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 Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Ashford Borough								
1	Ashford Central	1	12,341	12,341	-9%	13,993	13,993	-2%
2	Ashford East	1	12,938	12,938	-4%	14,272	14,272	0%
3	Ashford Rural East	1	12,625	12,625	-6%	13,488	13,488	-6%
4	Ashford Rural South	1	13,137	13,137	-3%	13,916	13,916	-3%
5	Ashford Rural West	1	13,571	13,571	1%	13,290	13,290	-7%
6	Ashford South	1	12,332	12,332	-9%	15,060	15,060	5%
7	Tenterden	1	13,603	13,603	1%	13,894	13,894	-3%
Canterbury City								
8	Canterbury City North	1	14,524	14,524	8%	15,221	15,221	6%
9	Canterbury City South	1	14,032	14,032	4%	14,709	14,709	3%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
10	Canterbury North	1	14,696	14,696	9%	15,401	15,401	8%
11	Canterbury South	1	12,355	12,355	-8%	12,949	12,949	-9%
12	Herne Bay East	1	13,955	13,955	3%	14,624	14,624	2%
13	Herne Village & Sturry	1	15,041	15,041	12%	15,763	15,763	10%
14	Whitstable East & Herne Bay West	1	13,790	13,790	2%	14,450	14,450	1%
15	Whitstable West	1	14,413	14,413	7%	15,104	15,104	6%
Dartford Borough								
16	Dartford East	1	12,214	12,214	-9%	13,988	13,988	-2%
17	Dartford North East	1	11,679	11,679	-13%	14,660	14,660	3%
18	Dartford Rural	1	12,997	12,997	-4%	13,660	13,660	-4%
19	Dartford West	1	12,783	12,783	-5%	14,038	14,038	-2%
20	Swanscombe & Greenhithe	1	10,037	10,037	-26%	15,271	15,271	7%

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
21	Wilmington	1	13,435	13,435	0%	13,985	13,851	-3%
Dover District								
22	Deal & Walmer	2	24,106	12,053	-11%	26,302	13,151	-8%
23	Dover North	1	11,003	11,003	-18%	13,896	13,896	-3%
24	Dover Town	2	24,468	12,234	-9%	26,655	13,328	-7%
25	Dover West	1	12,193	12,193	-10%	13,060	13,060	-9%
26	Sandwich	1	12,944	12,944	-4%	14,527	14,527	2%
Gravesham Borough								
27	Gravesend East	2	29,378	14,689	9%	30,094	15,047	5%
28	Gravesham Rural	1	16,192	16,192	20%	16,258	16,258	14%
29	Northfleet & Gravesend West	2	28,370	14,185	5%	29,933	14,967	5%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Maidstone Borough								
30	Maidstone Central	2	26,401	13,201	-2%	28,376	14,188	-1%
31	Maidstone North East	1	13,299	13,299	-1%	13,970	13,970	-2%
32	Maidstone Rural East	1	13,748	13,748	2%	14,494	14,494	1%
33	Maidstone Rural North	1	14,536	14,536	8%	15,201	15,201	6%
34	Maidstone Rural South	1	12,526	12,526	-7%	13,173	13,173	-8%
35	Maidstone Rural West	1	12,623	12,623	-6%	13,414	13,414	-6%
36	Maidstone South	1	13,699	13,699	2%	14,692	14,692	3%
37	Maidstone South East	1	12,144	12,144	-10%	13,777	13,777	-4%
Sevenoaks District								
38	Sevenoaks North & Darent Valley	1	16,034	16,034	19%	15,629	15,629	9%
39	Sevenoaks Rural North East	1	14,628	14,628	8%	14,154	14,154	-1%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
40	Sevenoaks Rural South	1	13,212	13,212	-2%	13,015	13,015	-9%
41	Sevenoaks Town	1	14,692	14,692	9%	14,715	14,715	3%
42	Sevenoaks West	1	14,740	14,740	9%	15,093	15,093	6%
43	Swanley	1	15,442	15,442	14%	15,416	15,416	8%
Shepway District								
44	Cheriton, Sandgate & Hythe East	1	14,252	14,252	6%	15,412	15,412	8%
45	Elham Valley	1	13,999	13,999	4%	14,527	14,527	2%
46	Folkestone East	1	12,962	12,962	-4%	13,453	13,453	-6%
47	Folkestone West	1	13,381	13,381	-1%	13,886	13,886	-3%
48	Hythe West	1	13,180	13,180	-2%	13,678	13,678	-4%
49	Romney Marsh	1	14,711	14,711	9%	15,269	15,269	7%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Swale Borough								
50	Faversham	1	14,563	14,563	8%	15,136	15,136	6%
51	Sheppey	2	29,216	14,608	8%	30,359	15,180	6%
52	Sittingbourne North	1	13,936	13,936	3%	14,483	14,483	1%
53	Sittingbourne South	1	13,496	13,496	0%	14,024	14,024	-2%
54	Swale East	1	12,224	12,224	-9%	12,704	12,704	-11%
55	Swale West	1	14,964	14,964	11%	15,551	15,551	9%
Thanet District								
56	Birchington & Rural	2	25,981	12,991	-4%	27,811	13,906	-3%
57	Broadstairs	1	14,170	14,170	5%	14,810	14,810	4%
58	Cliftonville	1	13,256	13,256	-2%	13,731	13,731	-4%
59	Margate	1	13,731	13,731	2%	14,328	14,328	0%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
60	Ramsgate	2	29,300	14,650	9%	30,792	15,396	8%
Tonbridge & Malling Borough								
61	Malling Central	1	12,315	12,315	0%	13,309	13,309	-7%
62	Malling North	1	13,212	13,212	-2%	14,279	14,279	0%
63	Malling North East	1	14,042	14,042	4%	15,175	15,175	6%
64	Malling Rural East	1	13,541	13,541	0%	14,637	14,637	2%
65	Malling West	1	12,428	12,428	-8%	13,431	13,431	-6%
66	Tonbridge	2	25,459	12,730	-6%	27,516	13,758	-4%
Tunbridge Wells Borough								
67	Cranbrook	1	13,898	13,898	3%	13,830	13,830	-3%
68	Tunbridge Wells East	1	13,140	13,140	-3%	13,201	13,201	-8%
69	Tunbridge Wells North	1	13,703	13,703	2%	13,362	13,362	-7%
70	Tunbridge Wells Rural	1	13,059	13,059	-3%	13,147	13,147	-8%

Table A1: (cont.) Final recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
71	Tunbridge Wells South	1	13,377	13,377	-1%	14,582	14,582	2%
72	Tunbridge Wells West	1	14,279	14,279	6%	14,096	14,096	-1%
Totals		81	1,092,651	-	-	1,157,965	-	-
Averages		-	-	13,490	-	-	14,296	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each 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 www.lgbce.org.uk

Political groups

- Canterbury & Coastal Liberal Democrats
- Crockham Hill Branch, Sevenoaks Conservative Association
- Dover & Deal Labour Party
- Faversham & Swale East Labour Party
- Folkestone & Hythe Labour Party
- Gravesham Constituency Labour Party
- Kent County Council Conservative Group
- Kent County Council Liberal Democrat Group
- Kent County Council UKIP Group
- Sevenoaks Conservative Association (two submissions)
- Sevenoaks Liberal Democrats
- Swale Borough Council Conservative Group

District councils

- Dover District Council
- Sevenoaks District Council
- Shepway District Council
- Swale Borough Council (Chief Executive)
- Thanet District Council
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

Members of Parliament

- T. Crouch MP (Chatham & Aylesford)
- H. Whately MP (Faversham & Mid Kent)

Councillors

- Kent County Councillor M. Baldock (Swale West division)
- Kent County Councillor M. Dance (Whitstable division)
- Kent County Councillor T. Gates (Faversham division)
- Kent County Councillor S. Hohler (Malling North division)
- Kent County Councillor M. Vye (Canterbury City South West division)
- Kent County Councillor C. Waters (Romney Marsh division)
- Kent County Councillor M. Whybrow (Hythe division)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor K. Bayley (Dunton Green & Riverhead ward)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor L. Ball (Swanley White Oak ward)

- Sevenoaks District Councillor L. Dyball (Swanley St Mary's ward)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor D. Esler (Westerham & Crockham Hill ward)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor A. Firth (Brasted, Chevening & Sundridge ward)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor M. Horwood (Eynsford ward)
- Sevenoaks District Councillor D. Morris (Hextable ward)
- Shepway District Councillor M. Dearden (Hythe ward)
- Shepway District Councillor C. Jeffrey (East Folkestone ward)
- Swanley Town Councillor V. Southern
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Councillor L. Hall (Benenden & Cranbrook ward)
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Councillor D. Scott (St John's ward)

Parish and town councils

- Addington Parish Council
- Badgers Mount Parish Council
- Bapchild Parish Council
- Burmarsh Parish Council
- Cranbrook & Sissinghurst Parish Council
- Dymchurch Parish Council
- East Malling & Larkfield Parish Council
- Egerton Parish Council
- Faversham Town Council (two submissions – Clerk and Cllr B. Martin)
- Folkestone Town Council
- Fordwich Town Council
- Harbledown & Rough Common Parish Council
- Headcorn Parish Council
- Higham Parish Council
- Hildenborough Parish Council
- Hythe Town Council
- Ightham Parish Council
- Kingsnorth Parish Council
- Luddenham Parish Meeting
- Lyminge Parish Council
- Milstead Parish Council and Rodmersham Parish Council (joint submission)
- New Romney Town Council
- Newchurch Parish Council
- Otford Parish Council
- Riverhead Parish Council
- St Mary in the Marsh Parish Council
- Saltwood Parish Council
- Sevenoaks Town Council
- Sholden Parish Council
- Shorne Parish Council
- Smarden Parish Council

- Southfleet Parish Council
- Swanley Town Council (Democratic Services Officer)
- Swanscombe & Greenhithe Town Council
- Teynham Parish Council
- Trottiscliffe Parish Council
- Walmer Parish Council
- West Malling Parish Council
- Westerham Parish Council

Local organisations

- Brents Community Association
- The Canterbury Society
- The Faversham Society
- Sandyhurst Lane Residents' Association
- South Ashford Community Forum
- Swanley Village Residents' Association
- Westerham Town Partnership

Local residents

- 69 local residents

Further limited consultation

Parish and town councils

- Badgers Mount Parish Council
- Dunton Green Parish Council
- Edenbridge Town Council
- Hextable Parish Council
- Knockholt Parish Council
- Otford Parish Council (two submissions)
- Riverhead Parish Council
- Seal Parish Council
- Sevenoaks Town Council
- Westerham Town Council

District councils

- Sevenoaks District Council

Councillors

- Kent County Councillor R. Gough
- Sevenoaks District Councillor A. Firth
- Sevenoaks District Councillor M. Horwood

Local residents

- One local resident

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

