

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for North Somerset Council

Electoral review

July 2014

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: 020 7664 8534

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 2014

Contents

Summary

1	Introduction	5
2	Analysis and final recommendations	7
	Submissions received	7
	Electorate figures	8
	Council size	8
	Electoral fairness	9
	General analysis	10
	Electoral arrangements	11
	Pill, Gordano Valley and rural north, east and south	11
	Portishead	16
	Nailsea	17
	Weston-super-Mare	18
	Clevedon	21
	Rural south west	23
	Conclusions	23
	Parish electoral arrangements	23
3	What happens next?	27
4	Mapping	29

Appendices

A	Table A1: Final recommendations for North Somerset Council	30
B	Glossary and abbreviations	34

Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of North Somerset Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority. The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in January 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
8 January 2013	Consultation on council size
26 March 2013	Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
5 June 2013	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
10 September 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
19 November 2013	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of further draft recommendations
12 February 2014	Publication of further draft recommendations and consultation on them
8 April 2014	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 50 members, comprising a pattern of 20 single-member wards and 15 two-member wards. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on warding arrangements, we have developed proposals based on a combination of the submissions received. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on the proposals from the Leader's Group and Liberal Democrat Group with modifications to better reflect the statutory criteria. In Portishead we have developed our own proposals in order to provide for a good balance between the statutory criteria. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the district. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 117 submissions, including comments covering the majority of North Somerset. We received a district wide scheme from the Council, 14 submissions from local councillors, 16 from parish councils, four from local organisations, three from political groups and 79 individual submissions from local residents and a petition from 27 local residents. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk

Further draft recommendations

Strong community identity evidence was received in opposition to the Commission's draft recommendations in large parts of the rural area. These particularly focused on the following areas:

- Pill & Easton-in-Gordano
- Yatton and Cleeve
- Backwell and Flax Bourton
- Wrington

As a result of proposed changes in these areas, the Commission undertook an additional period of limited consultation on recommendations for North Somerset. This consultation was to be limited to the rural area mentioned above.

During this consultation the Commission received 284 submissions, almost all relating to the rural area in question. We received submissions from the Group Leader of the Council, a joint submission from the four Group Leaders of the Council, the Deputy Leader and 10 other councillors. We also received submissions from 23 parish councils, three local organisations, one political organisation and 244 local residents.

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of 6.4% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the district as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics.

General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during consultations on our draft recommendations and further draft recommendations. As a result, we have proposed amendments to ward boundaries in Clevedon, Nailsea, Portishead and we have proposed changes to the name of wards in Clevedon and Weston-Super-Mare.

Our final recommendations for North Somerset are that the Council should have 50 members, with 20 single-member wards and 15 two-member wards. None of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2019.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for North Somerset. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for North Somerset in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at www.lgbce.org.uk

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

1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review North Somerset's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 The submission received from North Somerset Council during the initial stage of consultation of this review informed our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for North Somerset*, which were published on 10 September 2013. We undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 18 November 2013. We then undertook a period of consultation on further draft recommendations as a result of the strong community identity evidence that was received in opposition to the Commission's draft recommendations in large parts of the rural area. This ended on the 7 April 2014.

What is an electoral review?

3 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

4 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation¹ and 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

Why are we conducting a review in North Somerset?

5 Based on the December 2011 electorate figures, 13 of 36 wards (36%) have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the district. In addition, Gordano ward has a variance of 32% from the average and Portishead East ward has a variance of 68% from the average for the district.

How will the recommendations affect you?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward 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.

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

8 We have now finalised our recommendations for the electoral arrangements for North Somerset.

9 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for North Somerset Council is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act)² with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- 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

10 Legislation also requires that our recommendations are not based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but reflect estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the end of the review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward.

11 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. In all our reviews we therefore recommend strongly that, in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. We aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

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

Submissions received

13 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited North Somerset Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 45 submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including five district-wide schemes and two schemes covering the northern section of North Somerset. The district-wide submissions were from the Leader of the Council,

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

the Labour Group, the Liberal Democrat Group, the Independent/Green Group, and a local resident. The two schemes covering the north of the district were from the Conservative Association and the North Somerset Constituency Labour Party. In response to consultation on our draft recommendations we received 117 submissions and during further limited consultation for the rural area of the district we received 284 submissions. All of the submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

14 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of 6.4% to 2019. The forecasts provided by the Council took into account planned developments across the district as well as population forecasts made by the Office for National Statistics.

Council size

15 North Somerset currently has 61 councillors elected from 36 district wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders, Full Council and parish representatives. We received initial proposals from a group comprising the Leader of the Council and supporting councillors and local residents (referred to in its own submission as 'Group A', and for the purposes of clarity in this report as 'the Leader's Group') for a council size of 46. The Labour and Liberal Democrat groups proposed a council size of 51 and the Independent/Green Group proposed retaining the current council size of 61 elected members.

16 We considered the arguments made in support of these proposals. While we considered that there was a case for a reduction, we were not fully persuaded at that time by either 51 or 46. We therefore decided to consult on both of these proposed council sizes. This consultation ended on 18 February 2013.

17 During our public consultation on council size, we received 91 submissions. These were from the Leader's Group, Opposition Groups (a joint submission from the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independent/Green groups on the Council), five district councillors, two parish councillors, 15 town and parish councils, the North Somerset Conservative Association, the North Somerset Constituency Labour Party, two local organisations and 63 local residents.

18 The further submission from the Leader's Group focused on how a council size of 46 would work in terms of resilience and councillors' representational role. The Liberal Democrat, Labour and Independent/Green groups on the Council submitted a joint submission in favour of a council size of 51, which focused on resilience of councillor workloads and argued that the

committee system should be reinstated. Arguments supporting both 51 and 46 were included in the other submissions.

19 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. We considered that the Opposition Groups provided some evidence to demonstrate that a council size of 51 would better provide for resilience and effective scrutiny. On balance, we considered that insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that a council size of 46 would provide for effective representation and resilience.

20 We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 51 elected members as the basis of this electoral review. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 26 March 2013 and ended on 4 June 2013.

21 During the consultation on warding arrangements we received two representations directly relating to council size. The first asserted that 46 councillors was a more appropriate council size, while the second supported a council size of 51.

22 The schemes proposed by the Leader's Group, the Labour Group, and the Liberal Democrat Group were based on a council size of 50, rather than 51, councillors. The proposals indicated that a warding pattern based on 50 councillors provided for better electoral equality across the district and ensured that rural parishes were not included with urban areas with which they had few community links. We are persuaded that 50 councillors provide for the best allocation of councillors across North Somerset, and so have used this council size as the basis for our final recommendations.

Electoral fairness

23 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

24 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (159,897 in 2013 and 170,153 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council – 50 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 3,198 in 2013 and 3,403 by 2019.

25 Under our final recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the district by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for North Somerset.

General analysis

26 During the consultation on our draft recommendations, we received 117 submissions, including comments covering the majority of North Somerset. We received 14 submissions from local councillors, 16 from parish councils, five from local organisations, 79 individual submissions from local residents and a petition from 27 local residents.

27 We received a submission from the Council which did not propose any modifications to the proposed boundaries. The submission did comment on the proposed ward names under the draft recommendations.

28 In developing our final recommendations, we considered the possibility of significant alterations to our draft recommendations for the proposed boundaries in the rural area of the district. These proposals would change the boundaries of a total of 10 of the 35 wards proposed in our draft recommendations.

29 Owing to the scale of the changes proposed in these areas, we considered it appropriate to conduct further period of limited consultation on these alternative proposals in the specific areas affected prior to the publication of our final recommendations. We asked that respondents express a preference for either our draft recommendations or the alternative pattern of wards, with supporting evidence to justify one or other of these options.

30 During this consultation we received 284 submissions, almost all relating to the rural area in question. We received submissions from the Leader of the Council, a joint submission from the four Group Leaders on the Council, the Deputy Leader and 10 other councillors. We also received submissions from 23 parish councils, three local organisations, one political organisation and 244 local residents.

31 Having considered all the representations received, we have decided to largely confirm our draft recommendation as final subject to a number of small modifications.

32 Our final recommendations would result in 20 single-member wards, and 15 two-member wards. We consider our recommendations provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in North Somerset.

Electoral arrangements

33 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of North Somerset. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Pill, Gordano Valley and rural north, east and south (pages 11–16)
- Portishead (pages 16–17)
- Nailsea (pages 17–18)
- Weston-super-Mare (pages 18–21)
- Clevedon (pages 21–22)
- Rural south west (page 23)

34 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 30–33 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Pill, Gordano Valley and rural north, east and south

35 This area covers the Gordano Valley and the parishes of Abbots Leigh, Long Ashton and Wraxall & Failand. The draft recommendations in this part of the district were for the single-member wards of Backwell, Blagdon & Churchill, Congresbury & Puxton, Gordano Valley, Pill, Winford and Wrington and the two-member Long Ashton and Yatton wards. These wards were forecast to have 8% more, 7% fewer, 7% fewer, 1% more, 2% more, 1% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% fewer and an equal number of electors per councillor when compared to the average for the district by 2019, respectively. Under the draft recommendations, the parish of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano was divided between district wards, as it is under the current electoral arrangements. .

36 In response to the consultation on our draft recommendations 62 submissions were received which opposed the proposal to divide Pill & Easton-in-Gordano parish between wards. These included submissions from Abbots Leigh Parish Council, Pill Community Foundation, Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council, Councillor Davies and a number of local residents.

37 Respondents considered that dividing Pill & Easton-in-Gordano parish between wards did not reflect community identities in the area. Respondents indicated that the entire parish used local services and facilities including schools, doctors, churches, community associations and clubs Pill and Easton-in-Gordano. Some respondents also indicated that neighbouring parishes also shared community identities with Pill & Easton-in-Gordano. Evidence was received which indicated that the villages of Abbots Leigh, Leigh Woods, Failand and Portbury also used services and amenities in Pill & Easton-in-Gordano. Evidence also indicated that these villages all had shared common interests along the A369 corridor.

38 We received some support for the neighbouring Long Ashton ward. These included submissions from the parishes of Wraxall & Failand and Long Ashton. However, Long Ashton parish suggested that the area of Leigh

Woods in the north-east of the parish had shared community links with those areas along the A369.

39 Having considered the evidence received we investigated alternative warding patterns for the area. Firstly, we considered whether a ward could be created which was solely based on the parish of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano. These investigations indicated that this would not provide for a reasonable level of electoral equality as the ward would have 15% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Additionally, we did not consider that a ward solely based on the parish of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano would reflect the evidence received that neighbouring villages gravitated towards Pill & Easton-in-Gordano for services and amenities.

40 We received an alternative warding pattern for this area which proposed a series of modifications to the proposed wards of Long Ashton, Pill and Gordano Valley. The alternative warding pattern was for a two-member Pill & Easton-in-Gordano ward which included the parishes of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano, Portbury and Abbots Leigh. Additionally, the ward would include the Failand area of Wraxall & Failand parish and the Leigh Woods area from Long Ashton parish. This ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

41 The proposed two-member Long Ashton ward would include the remainder of Long Ashton parish and the parishes of Barrow Gurney, Dundry and Winford. This ward would have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Finally, the proposed single-member Gordano & Wraxall ward would include the remainder of Wraxall & Failand parish and the parishes of Walton-in-Gordano, Weston-in-Gordano, Clapton-in-Gordano, Tickenham and Flax Bourton. This ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019.

42 However, as a result of evidence received regarding other wards in this part of the district it would not be possible to implement this alternative warding pattern in isolation. We received evidence proposing further alternative warding patterns which are incompatible with the proposals outlined above. Furthermore, we were not wholly persuaded that sufficient evidence had been received to justify the consequential changes required to the wider warding pattern for the area.

43 We received a submission from Flax Bourton Parish Council which opposed being included in the proposed Winford ward. The Parish Council indicated that Flax Bourton had links with the neighbouring parish of Backwell. Evidence provided indicated that the residents of Flax Bourton used services in Backwell including shops, post office, schools, doctors and had shared public transport links.

44 To the east of Backwell Cleeve and Wrington parish councils, opposed the proposed Wrington ward. Cleeve Parish Council considered that it and the Wrington area were separated geographically and that the ward did not reflect community identities. Cleeve provided evidence suggesting that its links were west towards Yatton. The parish stated that bus routes from Cleeve ran

towards Yatton and that residents of Cleeve used services and amenities in Yatton. These included schools, doctors, opticians, vets, youth groups and sport clubs. This evidence was also supported by Yatton Parish Council which suggested that Cleeve and Yatton should be included in the same ward.

45 Wrington Parish Council also argued that it and Cleeve did not have a shared community identity. The Parish Council indicated that Wrington shared community identities with those villages to its south, such as Blagdon and Butcombe. This was also supported by Butcombe Parish Council in its submission.

46 Having considered the evidence received, we therefore investigated alternative warding patterns that would reflect the evidence of community identity received covering the parishes in the rural north, Gordano Valley and rural east.

47 The only alternative that would provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality, whilst reflecting the evidence of community identity received, would be a warding pattern in this area that is markedly different to the draft recommendations.

48 The alternative warding pattern resulted in the two-member wards of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano, Gordano & Wraxall, Long Ashton, Churchill & Wrington and Yatton. These wards would have 3% fewer, 6% more, 4% more, 12% fewer and 11% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

49 This alternative warding pattern reflected the community identity evidence received for this part of the district. This pattern would unite Pill & Easton-in-Gordano in a single district ward, as well as ensuring that the parishes of Yatton and Cleeve are in the same ward. It results in the parishes of Flax Bourton and Backwell being in the same ward and reflects the shared community identities of Wrington, Butcombe and Blagdon.

50 Brockley parish would be included in Churchill & Wrington ward which would have 12% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. Not including this parish in the ward would result in a 15% electoral variance. We considered that this alternative warding pattern reflected, as far as was possible, the evidence received relating to community identities during this stage of consultation.

51 We therefore undertook a period of further limited consultation on the alternative warding pattern in this part of the district.

52 During this consultation we received 284 submissions, almost all of which related to the rural area in question. We received submissions from the Leader of the Council, a joint submission from the four Group Leaders on the Council, the Deputy Leader and 10 other councillors. We also received submissions from 23 parish councils, three local organisations, one political organisation and 244 local residents.

53 Of these submissions, 29 supported the alternative warding pattern in this area. These included Abbots Leigh Parish Council which reiterated its support for proposals that combined the parish in a ward with Pill and Easton-in-Gordano on the grounds of community identities and links. Flax Bourton Parish Council also supported the alternative proposals which combined it in a ward with its 'service village' of Backwell. It also proposed that Backwell should be included in the proposed ward name of Gordano and Wraxall. Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council and the Leigh Woods Society also supported the alternative proposals. Kingston Seymour Parish Council was content that the alternative proposals would result in no further change to Yatton ward.

54 The vast majority of the submissions received opposed the alternative warding arrangements for a variety of reasons.

55 A combined submission from the leaders of the four groups on North Somerset Council (Conservative, Independent/Green, Labour and Liberal Democrat) did not support the alternative proposals on the grounds of community identity, a lack of representation in large multi-member wards and the geographical size of the proposed wards. They reiterated their support for the draft recommendations but also supported a scheme put forward by Councillor Leimdorfer (Congresbury ward), the leader of the Independent/Green group.

56 Councillor Leimdorfer's proposal, which was also supported by Councillor Davies (Pill ward) and the Pill Community Foundation, was to include the parish of Pill & Easton-in-Gordano in a single member ward. He also proposed a single-member Gordano ward containing the parishes of Clapton-in-Gordano, Portbury, Tickenham, Walton-in-Gordano, Weston-in-Gordano and the Wraxall portion of Wraxall and Failand parish. The final ward he proposed was a two-member Long Ashton ward comprising Abbots Leigh, Long Ashton and the Failand portion of Wraxall & Failand parish. Under this scheme Pill & Easton-in-Gordano would have 15% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019. The proposal would divide the parish council of Wraxall & Failand between district wards as do the alternative warding proposals to which two local councillors, two parish councils and 67 local residents objected. He also proposed a further amendment to his proposal to combine Backwell and Winford into a two-member ward. Councillor Coombs (Backwell) supported this. Finally, Councillor Leimdorfer suggested that 51 members may allow more flexibility in terms of warding arrangements but did not elaborate on how this may be achieved.

57 Councillors Ashton (Gordano), Baker (Portishead Redcliffe Bay), Cave (Wraxall & Long Ashton), Gregor (Winford) and Knight (Portishead Central) all opposed the alternative warding proposals and requested that our draft recommendations be confirmed as final. Councillor Cole (Nailsea East) agreed but also queried whether 51 councillors would provide a better allocation of councillors across the district.

58 A number of parish councils responded to the further limited

consultation in this area. Backwell Parish Council support the draft recommendations with a modification that would result in Backwell and Winford being combined in the same ward as suggested by Councillor Leimdorfer and supported by Councillor Coombs and Backwell Residents' Association. Barrow Gurney Parish Council also supported the draft recommendations but stated that a two-member Backwell & Winford ward was also an acceptable solution.

59 The submissions from the parish councils of Blagdon, Brockley, Burrington, Clapton-in-Gordano, Congresbury, Dundry, Kenn, Long Ashton, Puxton, Tickenham, Winford and Wraxall & Failand all stated their opposition to the alternative warding proposals and requested that the draft recommendations be confirmed as final.

60 Butcombe Parish Council supported the alternative proposals which would place it in a ward with Blagdon but was concerned about the size of the proposed three-member Churchill & Wrington ward.

61 Wrington Parish Council also objected to the alternative warding proposals but submitted a different configuration from the draft recommendations. Its proposal resulted in the single-member wards of Backwell, Gordano, Pill, Winford and Wrington & Blagdon, and the two-member wards of Congresbury & Churchill, Long Ashton & Wraxall and Yatton. These wards are forecast to have 8% more, 1% more, 2% more, 1% less, 3% less, 6% less, 2% less and equal to the average number of electors per councillor when compared to the district average by 2019, respectively.

62 Cleeve Parish Council objected to both the draft recommendations and the alternative proposals that placed it in Wrington ward on the grounds of community identity.

63 North Somerset Conservative Association also objected to the further draft recommendations and requested that the Commission confirm the draft recommendations as final.

64 Of the 244 submissions from local residents, 25 supported the alternative warding proposals, while the remainder opposed them, in particular the proposals for the Winford area to be included in a ward with Long Ashton; Wraxall & Failand parish to be split between wards; and for the large three-member ward of Churchill & Wrington.

65 After considering all the representations received, we have concluded that the draft recommendations provide the most appropriate warding pattern for this area. In terms of evidence, it is clear there are strong arguments for both warding proposals. However, it is also clear from the further limited consultation that the draft recommendations will provide a better balance between the statutory criteria. We consider that they will generally reflect community identities across the wider area as well as providing for wards that are not too geographically large. In this way we consider that the draft recommendations are more likely to secure effective and convenient local government

66 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final. Our final recommendations are for the single-member wards of Backwell, Blagdon & Churchill, Congresbury & Puxton, Gordano Valley, Pill, Winford and Wrington, and the two-member Long Ashton and Yatton wards. These wards were forecast to have 8% more, 7% fewer, 7% fewer, 1% more, 2% more, 1% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% fewer and an equal number of electors per councillor when compared to the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

Portishead

67 The town of Portishead is located in the north of the district, bounded by the Severn Estuary to the north and the Gordano Valley to the south. The draft recommendations for Portishead were for single-member Portishead North and Portishead South wards and two-member Portishead East and Portishead West wards. These wards were forecast to have 3% more, 5% more, 5% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

68 During the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received six submissions relating to this area. These included submissions from Portishead Town Council, a joint submission from Councillors Ashton, Baker, Knight, McMurray and Pasley, the Liberal Democrat Group and North Somerset Constituency Labour Party. None of these respondents supported the draft recommendations for Portishead.

69 Respondents mainly opposed the draft recommendations for Portishead on the grounds that they were based on a mixed warding pattern of single- and two-member wards. Concerns were raised that this would be confusing for the electorate, particularly as Portishead currently has a pattern of single-member wards.

70 Portishead Town Council and the Liberal Democrat Group proposed an alternative warding pattern for the area. These alternatives included dividing the proposed two-member Portishead East and Portishead West wards into single-member wards. Having considered the representations received, we are of the view that the evidence does not relate to community identity but focuses on the principal of single- and multi-member wards, something which we do not take into account when formulating warding patterns where the local authority has not requested a single-member ward review. Therefore, we do not propose to modify the overall pattern of wards covering Portishead.

71 However, in light of the representation from Portishead Town Council, we have decided to modify the boundary between our proposed Portishead North and Portishead East wards. The Town Council indicated that the boundary between the wards divided Burlington Court from Portishead North ward. Including Burlington Court in this ward would result in the wards of Portishead North and Portishead East having 5% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019, respectively. We consider that this modification would reflect transport links in the area whilst still providing for reasonable levels of electoral equality.

72 Prior to the publication of this report, we identified an error in the calculation of electorate for the town which had a significant impact on Portishead North ward. We calculated that, under our draft recommendations, the ward would have an electoral variance of 19% more electors per councillor than the district average rather than 5% as stated in our report.

73 To resolve this matter a slight modification to the boundaries between our proposed Portishead North and Portishead West wards is required. We therefore propose that properties on West Hill to the west of La Sainte Union Convent and those on streets leading off West Hill as far as Quantock Road be included in Portishead West ward. Those properties to the east of the convent and as far as the junction of West Hill with Nore Road and Combe Avenue will be included in Portishead North ward.

74 Under our final recommendations, our proposed single-member Portishead North and Portishead South wards and two-member Portishead East and Portishead West wards would have 8% more, 5% more, 3% fewer and 9% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019.

Nailsea

75 The town of Nailsea is located in the centre of the district, and is bounded to the west and south by the river Blind Yeo and to the north by Tickenham Moor and the river Land Yeo. The draft recommendations for this area were for the single-member wards of Nailsea Golden Valley, Nailsea West End, Nailsea Yeo and Nailsea Youngwood. These wards are forecast to have 4% fewer, 8% fewer, 8% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

76 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received four submissions in regards to Nailsea. These included submissions from Councillor Blatchford (Nailsea North and West), Councillor Cole (Nailsea East) and Councillor Barber (Nailsea East).

77 Councillor Blatchford opposed the draft recommendations for Nailsea and proposed an alternative warding pattern. He proposed combining the single-member Nailsea Youngwood and Nailsea Golden Valley wards to form a two-member Nailsea East & Central ward which would have an equal number of electors per councillor to the district average by 2019. He also proposed combining the single-member Nailsea Yeo and Nailsea West End wards to create a two-member Nailsea West ward, which would have 8% fewer electors than the district average by 2019. Councillor Blatchford did not provide sufficient evidence of community identities to suggest why this pattern of wards would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. The evidence from Councillor Blatchford largely focused on the principal of single- and multi-member wards. We consider that evidence has not been received to support these alternatives and do not intend to adopt them as part of our final recommendations.

78 The representation from Councillor Cole largely supported the draft

recommendations for Nailsea subject to three small modifications. Councillor Cole indicated that not all of the properties on Bucklands Batch and Bucklands End were included in the same ward and proposed that all the properties on both roads should be included in Nailsea Golden Valley ward. He also considered that the boundary between Nailsea Golden Valley and Nailsea Yeo wards should follow the centre of Station Road in its entirety, rather than following the rear of properties in one small area. Lastly, Councillor Cole proposed that Porlock Gardens should be included in Nailsea Golden Valley ward. This modification was also supported by Councillor Barber.

79 The modifications proposed by Councillor Cole would result in the wards of Nailsea Yeo, Nailsea Golden Valley and Nailsea Youngwood having 8% fewer, 1% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

80 We consider that Councillor Cole's proposals relating to the roads of Bucklands Batch, Bucklands End and Porlock Gardens have merit and have decided to adopt them as part of our final recommendations. In respect of the boundary along Station Road, rather than follow the centre of the road, we recommend that the boundary should follow the rear of all the properties to the south of Station Road. This would result in the wards of Nailsea Yeo and Nailsea Golden Valley having 6% fewer and an equal number of electors per councillor to the average by 2019, respectively. We consider these modifications will provide for more easily identifiable ward boundaries, unite all of the properties on Station Road in one ward and provide for good levels of electoral equality in the wards affected.

81 In addition, Councillor Cole put forward amendments to the proposed ward names for the town. He suggested that the wards be renamed Nailsea East, Nailsea West, Nailsea North and Nailsea Central. We are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to justify amending the proposed ward names as part of our final recommendations.

82 Under our final recommendations the proposed single-member Nailsea Yeo, Nailsea Golden Valley, Nailsea Youngwood and Nailsea West End wards would have 6% fewer, equal to, 1% fewer and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

Weston-super-Mare

83 Weston-super-Mare is the largest urban area in North Somerset, and is located in the west of the district. The draft recommendations were for a pattern of two single-member and nine two-member wards covering the Weston-super-Mare area and the parishes of Wick St Lawrence and St Georges.

Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke

84 The draft recommendations for this area were for a two-member ward which covered the parish of Kewstoke, the Worlebury area of Weston-super-Mare and part of the Worle area of Weston-super-Mare.

85 In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, we received three submissions relating to this ward. Councillor Willis and Councillor Pilgrim (Weston-super-Mare Milton and Old Worle) both objected to this ward. They considered that Monks Hill separated the areas of Kewstoke and Worlebury. Both councillors considered that Kewstoke should be included in a ward with Wick St Lawrence as both the areas were of a more rural nature.

86 We also received a submission from Kewstoke Parish Council opposing the draft recommendations in this area. The Parish Council indicated that the areas of Kewstoke and Worlebury were linked by Monks Hill and that the two communities shared community identities including schools and facilities in the villages. The Parish Council did not propose the Kewstoke area be included in a ward with Wick St Lawrence. The Parish Council did propose an alternative warding pattern, which was to divide the two-member Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke ward into two single-member wards. The Parish Council proposed a single-member Kewstoke ward which combined the parish with the Worlebury area. This ward would have 7% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019.

87 This proposal would also require a number of consequential changes to neighbouring wards as it would not be possible to create a single-member ward for the remainder of Kewstoke and ensure good electoral equality. The area of housing centred on Forest Drive would need to be included in the two-member Weston-super-Mare Ashcombe ward which would result in the ward having 9% more electors than the average for the district. The part of Worle included in the proposed two-member Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke ward would need to be transferred to Weston-super-Mare South Worle ward and form a three-member ward which would have 3% fewer electors than the average for the district.

88 Having considered the evidence, we consider that an alternative pattern of wards covering this area would not provide a better balance between the statutory criteria. While we note that the alternative warding pattern put forward would provide for good electoral equality, we are not persuaded that we have sufficient evidence on the grounds of community identities and interests to justify a significant change our recommendations for this area of the town. Furthermore, we consider our recommendations, while combining different communities, do not divide communities between wards. In light of this, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

Weston-super-Mare Milton/Bournville/Uphill and Central

89 The draft recommendations for this area were for the two-member wards of Milton, Bournville, Uphill and Central. In response to the consultation on the draft recommendations, the Commission received six submissions in relation to these wards.

90 Councillor Tucker (Weston-super-Mare East) considered that the proposed Weston-super-Mare Milton ward did not reflect local communities as

he considered that the western part of the ward centred on Earlham Grove and Locking Road was not part of the Milton community. Councillor Tucker proposed that the ward be divided into two single-member wards. He proposed single-member Earlham and Milton wards which would have 1% more and 4% more electors than the district average by 2019, respectively. This proposal was also supported by the Liberal Democrat Group.

91 In addition to this submission we received a representation from a local resident who considered that the Potteries Estate (centred on Bridge Road) should be included in the proposed Weston-super-Mare Milton ward. Under the draft recommendations the Potteries Estate was included in Weston-super-Mare Bournville ward. The resident argued that this estate was not part of the Bournville community as they were separated from each other by the A370 dual-carriageway. The resident also indicated that those living in the Potteries Estate area used facilities and amenities on Locking Road. Albeit the Potteries Estate and Locking Road are divided by a railway line, the resident considered that this was not a barrier as they were linked via a footbridge. Including the Potteries Estate in the proposed Weston-super-Mare Milton ward would result in it having 9% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019. Consequently, this modification would result in the proposed Weston-super-Mare Bournville ward having 9% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019. We also noted that including the Potteries Estate in the single-member Earlham ward as proposed by Councillor Tucker would result in an electoral variance of 13%.

92 We also received other representations which proposed different modifications to the proposed Weston-super-Mare Bournville ward. A submission was received from Councillor Bryant (Weston-super Mare Clarence and Uphill) who considered that the Coronation Estate should be included in Weston-super-Mare Bournville ward. Under the draft recommendations we proposed that the Coronation Estate be included in Weston-super-Mare Uphill ward. Councillor Bryant, Councillor Parker and Councillor Clayton (Weston-super-Mare South) all argued that the Coronation Estate shared community identities with the Bournville area. They indicated that residents living in the Coronation Estate attended schools in the Bournville area and that the doctor's surgery, church, shops and other local facilities in Bournville were within walking distance of the Coronation Estate.

93 In order to provide for a pattern of wards in the area with reasonable levels of electoral equality Councillor Bryant proposed modifications to the wards of Weston-super-Mare Bournville, Weston-super-Mare Uphill and Weston-super-Mare Central. He proposed that the Coronation Estate be included in Weston-super-Mare Bournville ward and the area of housing centred on Sunnyside Road and bounded by Drove Road should be included in Weston-super-Mare Central ward. Lastly, he proposed that the Clarence Park area should be included in Weston-super-Mare Uphill ward. These modifications would result in the wards of Weston-super-Mare Bournville, Central and Uphill having 4% more, 9% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

94 Having considered the alternative warding patterns we consider that

evidence has not been received to justify modifying the draft recommendations in this part of Weston-super-Mare. We acknowledge that the alternative proposals put forward would provide for reasonable electoral equality and would, in part, reflect community identities. However, in a number of other areas we consider the proposals would divide communities between wards, or create wards of too small a geographical size to encompass a cohesive community. The proposals would also require consequential amendments across that town for which we do not have sufficient evidence to justify. In light of this, we have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

Weston-super-Mare Ashcombe

95 We received submissions which proposed alternative names for the ward of Weston-super-Mare Ashcombe. Two local residents and the Council proposed the ward be renamed Weston-super-Mare West. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed that the ward be renamed Weston-super Mare Hillside. All respondents opposed the ward name of Weston-super-Mare Ashcombe as they considered Ashcombe did not reflect the entire community included in the ward. We do not propose that the ward be renamed Weston-super-Mare West as this name could be confusing as the ward does not cover the entire western area of Weston-super-Mare. However, we are persuaded to adopt the ward name of Weston-super-Mare Hillside as part of our final recommendations.

96 As part of our further consultation we received a submission from Weston-super-Mare Town Council which made a number of suggestions for changes to ward names. Of these we have decided to rename our proposed parish ward of Kewstoke as it does not adequately reflect the name of the community located in the town council ward. We therefore propose to rename this parish ward Worlebury. We do not recommend any further changes to ward boundaries or names in the Weston-super-Mare area.

97 Our final recommendations for Weston-super-Mare are for the single-member ward of Weston-super-Mare Mid Worle and the two-member wards of Weston-super-Mare Bournville, Weston-super-Mare Central, Weston-super-Mare Hillside, Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke, Weston-super-Mare North Worle, Weston-super-Mare Milton, Weston-super-Mare South Worle, Weston-super-Mare Uphill and Weston-super-Mare Winterstoke. These wards would 4% fewer, 3% fewer, 7% fewer, 2% more, 1% more, 7% fewer, 3% more, 4% more, 2% fewer and equal to the average number of electors per councillor when compared to the district average by 2019, respectively.

Clevedon

98 Clevedon is located on the north-west coast of the district, a few miles south of Portishead. The draft recommendations in this area were for the single-member wards of Clevedon East, Clevedon Walton, Clevedon West, Clevedon Yeo and Clevedon Moor. These wards were forecast to have 6% more, 7% more, 6% fewer, 4% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

99 We received two submissions regarding this area in response to the consultation on our draft recommendations. These included a submission from Clevedon Town Council which proposed two minor amendments to the draft recommendations. The Town Council proposed that the boundary between Clevedon East and Clevedon West wards follow Prince's Road rather than follow the rear of properties on Albert Road. The Town Council considered this boundary would provide for improved levels of electoral equality and a more easily identifiable ward boundary. The Town Council also proposed that three properties in the Fir Wood area be included in the proposed Clevedon East ward. Under the draft recommendations these properties were included in Clevedon Walton ward. These modifications result in the wards of Clevedon East, Clevedon West and Clevedon Walton having 4% more, 3% fewer and 7% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

100 We consider that the modifications proposed by Clevedon Town Council would provide for wards with more easily identifiable boundaries, whilst still ensuring good electoral equality. We have therefore decided to accept these modifications as part of our final recommendations.

101 The Council proposed that Clevedon Moor ward be renamed Clevedon South. The Council indicated that the name 'Moor' related to an area east of the M5 and outside of the area covered by the ward. We have decided to adopt the Council's proposed ward name as part of our final recommendations.

102 Clevedon Town Council also commented on the number of parish councillors that were proposed as part of the consequential parish warding arrangements for the town. Under the draft recommendations it was proposed that Clevedon Town Council return 20 parish councillors, one fewer than at present and that these represent five parish wards. In response to the consultation, the Town Council proposed that the number of parish councillors should be reduced to 15 and that each of the parish wards proposed under the draft recommendations should return three parish councillors.

103 In retrospect we have concluded that we should not have proposed a change to the number of councillors for the Town Council in our draft recommendations. We believe these matters should be dealt with locally, through a community governance review conducted by North Somerset Council. Our final recommendations for electoral arrangements for Clevedon Town Council are listed in detail towards the end of this report.

104 Under our final recommendations the single-member wards of Clevedon East, Clevedon South, Clevedon Walton, Clevedon West and Clevedon Yeo are forecast to have 4% more, 2% more, 7% more, 3% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2019, respectively.

Rural south

105 This area covers the rural parishes around Weston-super-Mare. The draft recommendations in this area were for the single member Wick St Lawrence and St Georges wards and the two-member Banwell & Winscombe and Hutton & Locking wards. These wards were forecast to have 2% more, 8% more and 9% more electors per councillor than the average for the district by 2019, respectively.

106 We received one submission regarding this area. This submission was from Bleadon Parish Council which considered that Bleadon should be included in the name of our proposed Hutton & Locking ward. The Parish Council indicated that Bleadon also formed a large part of the ward. We consider that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify modifying the proposed ward name. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for this area as final.

Conclusions

107 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2013 and 2019 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements:

	Final recommendations	
	2013	2019
Number of councillors	50	50
Number of electoral wards	35	35
Average number of electors per councillor	3,198	3,403
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	0
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	2	0

Final recommendation

North Somerset Council should comprise 50 councillors serving 35 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map(s) accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

108 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 divisions or wards it must

also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

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

110 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Clevedon parish.

Final recommendations

Clevedon Town Council should return 21 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: East (returning four members), Walton (returning five members), West (returning four members), Yeo (returning four members) and South (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

111 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Nailsea parish.

Final recommendations

Nailsea Town Council should return 20 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Golden Valley (returning five members), West End (returning five members), Yeo (returning five members) and Youngwood (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

112 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Pill & Easton-in-Gordano parish.

Final recommendations

Pill & Easton-in-Gordano Parish Council should return 15 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Easton-in-Gordano (returning four members) and Pill (returning 11 members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

113 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Portishead parish.

Final recommendations

Portishead Town Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: East (returning five members), North (returning two members), South (returning two members) and West (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

114 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Weston-super-Mare parish.

Final recommendations

Weston-super-Mare Town Council should return 31 parish councillors, as at present, representing 10 wards: Bournville (returning three members), Central (returning three members), Hillside (returning three members), Mid Worle (returning two members), Milton (returning four members), North Worle (returning three members), South Worle (returning four members), Uphill (returning three members), Winterstoke (returning three members) and Worlebury (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 What happens next?

115 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for North Somerset Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for North Somerset Council in 2015.

Equalities

116 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.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for North Somerset

117 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for North Somerset Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for North Somerset Council.

You can also view our draft recommendations for North Somerset Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for North Somerset Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Backwell	1	3,672	3,672	15%	3,684	3,684	8%
2	Banwell & Winscombe	2	6,182	3,091	-3%	6,259	3,130	-8%
3	Blagdon & Churchill	1	3,136	3,136	-2%	3,170	3,170	-7%
4	Clevedon East	1	3,470	3,470	9%	3,530	3,530	4%
5	Clevedon South	1	3,480	3,480	9%	3,480	3,480	2%
6	Clevedon Walton	1	3,540	3,540	11%	3,643	3,643	7%
7	Clevedon West	1	3,227	3,227	1%	3,292	3,292	-3%
8	Clevedon Yeo	1	3,501	3,501	9%	3,536	3,536	4%
9	Congresbury & Puxton	1	3,144	3,144	-2%	3,180	3,180	-7%
10	Gordano Valley	1	3,413	3,413	7%	3,449	3,4549	1%
11	Hutton & Locking	2	5,379	2,690	-16%	7,393	3,697	9%
12	Long Ashton	2	6,608	3,304	3%	6,701	3,351	-2%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for North Somerset Council

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13 Nailsea Golden Valley	1	3,348	3,348	5%	3,396	3,396	0%
14 Nailsea West End	1	3,110	3,110	-3%	3,127	3,127	-8%
15 Nailsea Yeo	1	3,171	3,171	-1%	3,188	3,188	-6%
16 Nailsea Youngwood	1	3,354	3,354	5%	3,356	3,356	-1%
17 Pill	1	3,458	3,458	8%	3,470	3,470	2%
18 Portishead East	2	4,739	2,370	-26%	6,619	3,310	-3%
19 Portishead North	1	3,675	3,675	15%	3,679	3,679	8%
20 Portishead South	1	3,242	3,242	1%	3,582	3,582	5%
21 Portishead West	2	7,295	3,648	14%	7,448	3,724	9%
22 Weston-super-Mare Bournville	2	6,368	3,184	0%	6,577	3,289	-3%
23 Weston-super-Mare Central	2	6,183	3,092	-3%	6,315	3,158	-7%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for North Somerset Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24	Weston-super-Mare Hillside	2	6,527	3,264	2%	6,964	3,482	2%
25	Weston-super-Mare Kewstoke	2	6,715	3,358	5%	6,867	3,434	1%
26	Weston-super-Mare Mid Worle	1	3,166	3,166	-1%	3,253	3,253	-4%
27	Weston-super-Mare Milton	2	6,771	3,386	6%	6,986	3,493	3%
28	Weston-super-Mare North Worle	2	6,241	3,121	-2%	6,359	3,180	-7%
29	Weston-super-Mare South Worle	2	5,912	2,956	-8%	7,081	3,541	4%
30	Weston-super-Mare Uphill	2	6,520	3,260	2%	6,687	3,344	-2%
31	Weston-super-Mare Winterstoke Wick St	2	4,706	2,353	-26%	6,834	3,417	0%
32	Lawrence & St Georges	1	3,466	3,466	8%	3,485	3,485	2%
33	Winford	1	3,324	3,324	4%	3,379	3,379	-1%

Table A1 (cont.): Final recommendations for North Somerset Council

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2013)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2019)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
34 Wrington	1	3,317	3,317	4%	3,372	3,372	-1%
35 Yatton	2	6,537	3,269	2%	6,812	3,406	0%
Totals	50	159,897	-	-	170,153	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,198	-	-	3,403	-

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

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

Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward or division, expressed in parishes or existing wards or divisions, or parts of either
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 imbalance	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

Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at www.nationalparks.gov.uk
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
PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
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

