



Exeter City Council

A **SPECIAL MEETING** of **EXETER CITY COUNCIL** will be held at the **GUILDHALL, HIGH STREET, EXETER** on **WEDNESDAY 25 MARCH 2015**, at 6.00 pm, at which you are hereby summoned to attend.

The following business is proposed to be transacted:-

1. **ELECTORAL REVIEW OF EXETER**

To receive the recommendation of minute 36 below of the Executive meeting held on 17 March 2015. 3 - 18

The report of the Corporate Manager Democratic and Civic Support as submitted detailing the Council's proposed submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), on new ward boundaries for the City.

Councillor Henson, having given notice under Standing Order no.44 spoke on this item. He raised concerns regarding the change of boundary in the northern area of Thornpark Rise and if this would have an impact on the Parliamentary Boundaries.

The Corporate Manager Democratic and Civic Support clarified that this submission was for the ward boundaries within the city only and did not involve the Parliamentary boundaries which would be the subject of a separate review at some point in the future. The proposals were to reduce the number of wards from 18 to 13 and sought to balance the number of electorate within the wards. The Council's official submission was required to be submitted to the LGBCE by 30 March 2015.

The Leader stated that any proposed changes to the ward names could be put forward when the submission was considered by Council at its meeting on 25 March.

Whilst the majority of Members supported the proposals, two Members reserved the right to submit alternative proposals.

Members commended all officers involved in putting this submission together.

RECOMMENDED to Council that the proposed ward boundaries, as indicated on the map and narrative attached to the report presented to the Executive, form the Council's official submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, in response to its current consultation on the electoral review of Exeter.

(In accordance with Standing Order 43, Councillors Fullam and Leadbetter requested their abstention from voting be recorded)

A plan of seating in the Guildhall is attached as an annexe.

Date: 17 March 2015

Karime Hassan
Chief Executive &
Growth Director

NOTE: Members are asked to sign the Attendance Register

REPORT TO Executive

Date of Meeting: 17 March 2015

Report of: Corporate Manager, Democratic & Civic Support, Electoral Registration and Returning Officer

Title: ELECTORAL REVIEW OF EXETER

Is this a Key Decision?

Yes

Is this an Executive or Council Function?

Council

1. What is the report about?

1.1 This report details the Council's submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE), on new ward boundaries for the City.

2. Recommendations:

2.1 That it be recommended to Council that the proposed ward boundaries, as indicated on the map and narrative attached to this report, form the Council's official submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, in response to its current consultation on the electoral review of Exeter.

3. Reasons for the recommendation:

3.1 Following the resolution of Council on 20th January 2015 regarding the number of Councillors required for the City Council (39) and the cycle of elections (by thirds), the Council has been informed that a public consultation exercise was being undertaken by the LGBCE, as to the ward boundaries in the City which would deliver this.

Two meetings of the cross party Electoral Review Working Group were held on 26th February and 6th March 2015.

The Working Group agreed the proposed ward boundaries as the Council's submission to the consultation, and requests Council's approval of this to meet the timetable of all submissions being required by 30th March 2015. This report also details the narrative behind the Group's recommendations, which will, together with this report and supporting map, form the submission to the LGBCE.

4. What are the resource implications including non financial resources.

4.1 There are no resource implications arising from this report.

4.2 Members are however reminded that additional temporary staffing has been employed within the elections team to primarily support this process. All out elections in 2016 (which are a consequence of the decision to continue the practice of elections by thirds) will incur the Council in additional costs to those previously anticipated and budgeted for. These will be addressed as and when they occur.

5. Section 151 Officer comments:

- 5.1 The need for an additional budget to enable the elections to take place in 2016 will be added to the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan as an unavoidable spending pressure. The funds will be drawn from the General Fund Working Balance.

6. What are the legal aspects?

- 6.1 Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the electoral arrangements for every principal authority in England must be reviewed from time to time.

7. Monitoring Officer's comments:

- 7.1 This report raises no issues for the Monitoring Officer.

8. Report details:

- 8.1 As part of an overall consultation exercise being undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) into future electoral arrangements in Exeter, the Council is asked to consider the submission of its own proposals for future ward boundaries in the City.

- 8.2 In consideration of this, the Council will need to submit a proposal which, in its opinion, best meets the LGBCE's three criteria, namely:-

- To deliver electoral equality where each councillor represents roughly the same number of electors as others across the city;
- That the pattern of wards should, as far as possible, reflect the interests and identities of local communities; and
- That the electoral arrangements should provide for effective and convenient local government.

- 8.3 It should be noted that the consultation is open to any interested person or organisation, and that each response (including the Council's) is given equal weighting by the LGBCE.

- 8.4 In drawing up the attached proposals, the Electoral Review Working Group has taken into account the above criteria, as well as the requirement that as the overall number of councillors will be 39, the presumption is that there should be 13 wards in the City, each being represented by 3 councillors. This also therefore ensures that all parts of the City undertake elections each and every year (3 for the City Council and one for the County Council), thereby ensuring equality in voting across the City.

- 8.5 During its discussions, the Working Group considered the following issues:-

- The importance of local communities across the City and the need to ensure that as far as practicably possible, their identity be retained in any new electoral wards;
- The St James Neighbourhood Forum and its status in the city's electoral map;
- A need to minimise any confusion to electors with unnecessary changes;
- A need to ensure that any proposed ward names best reflect local identities;
- A need to ensure that as far as practicably possible, ward boundaries follow definitive lines (river, roads, railway lines etc.) on the ground so that they can be

- easily identifiable;
- Development proposals up to and including 2020.
- 8.6 Once the Council has submitted its proposals, these will be taken into account alongside all others received, with the LGBCE then publishing its own recommendations as to proposed ward boundaries, in June 2015 for a further round of consultation. It is intended to bring these proposals to the Executive on 14 July.
- 9. How does the decision contribute to the Council's Corporate Plan?**
- 9.1 The suggestion put forward here, will ensure that the Council maintains its ability to deliver its services efficiently and effectively without a detrimental impact on Members' perspective and workloads.
- 10. What risks are there and how can they be reduced?**
- 10.1 If the Council does not produce a submission on ward boundaries (as proposed), the LGBCE will be unable to take the Council's views into account, when drawing up its own recommendations. The Council may, therefore, end up having to work within something which may not best reflect the way in which the Council wishes to work. It is therefore in the Council's best interests to make a submission which, in its opinion, best reflects its own requirements.
- 11. What is the impact of the decision on equality and diversity; health and wellbeing; safeguarding children, young people and vulnerable adults, community safety and the environment?**
- 11.1 The proposed decision will ensure that the Council maintains its ability to deliver its services effectively and efficiently without a detrimental impact on members' perspective and workloads, ensuring that elected councillors continue to best represent their local area and its interests whilst bearing in mind the community's needs.
- 12. Are there any other options?**
- 12.1 None that are considered appropriate or favourable to the Council and its interests.

John Street
Corporate Manager, Democratic & Civic Support, Electoral Registration and Returning Officer

Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1972 (as amended)
Background papers used in compiling this report:-

Contact for enquires:
Democratic Services (Committees)
Room 2.3
01392 265275

This page is intentionally left blank

Exeter City Council Electoral Review

Warding Patterns Submission



March 2015

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Equality of Representation
3. Community Identities and Interests
4. Proposed Warding Arrangements

1. Introduction

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is carrying out an electoral review of the City. The LGBCE has finished its consultation on the size of the Council and is minded that Exeter City Council should have 39 members in the future.

The Commission has now asked for submissions proposing Warding patterns that reflect this change. Any group or individual is able to put forward suggestions on Warding patterns for all or part of the City. The LGBCE will consider all submissions and propose a warding pattern for the City and then run a ten week consultation on these proposed warding patterns before it publishes its final recommendations. Boundaries will be changed following the laying down of an Order in Parliament and will take effect from the city council elections in May 2016.

In preparing its submission proposing new ward arrangements for the City, the Council must take account of:

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

2. Equality of representation

Based on a council size of 39 and growth projections, the projected electorate in 2020 is 94,016 which means the average number of electors for each Councillor is 2,411.

3. Community identities and interests

Using maps, the Electoral Review Steering Group met on two occasions to consider the proposed ward boundaries, bearing in mind the above criteria. It identified key communities within the City, as well as any man-made or natural barriers such as major roads, rivers and water courses that acted as boundaries between communities. Using the Group and officer's knowledge of communities within the City, warding arrangements are proposed that the Steering Group feels best reflect the community identities and interests of the area, whilst ensuring the proposals would deliver electoral equality.

The table provided as **Appendix 1** provides a summary of proposed warding arrangements and the figures to support the proposals. A copy of a map showing the proposed new Ward boundaries is also enclosed as **Appendix 2** document.

This submission also provides evidence and rationale for how the proposed warding arrangements reflect community identities and interests by highlighting local amenities and facilities that may be either a focal point or natural break between communities; the history and tradition of individual areas which may be the basis of their sense of community identity; and any natural or man-made physical barriers that mark the

boundary between different communities. The list is not exhaustive; it is illustrative of the connections that bind local communities.

The submission was further considered by the Council's Executive Committee on 17 March 2015 and formally approved by Full Council on the 25 March 2015.

PROPOSED WARDING ARRANGEMENTS

The table below shows how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

It is proposed that all Wards are represented by 3 councillors.

Ward Name	Forecast electorate 2020	Forecast electoral variance in 2020	Evidence and rationale that the proposals meet the 3 statutory criteria
Alphington	6970	-3.62%	This is an existing 3 member ward, which has been extended to its previous North Eastern boundary, but retains its strong natural boundaries of the Western and Southern boundary of the City, the River Exe and railway line. There is a strong community within Alphington itself, where many local facilities are provided. The area which has been added to this ward is serviced predominantly by roads accessed via the mainroad which dissects the ward.
Duryard	7571	+4.69%	This combines the existing Duryard ward with the existing St James ward. It encompasses much of the student accommodation required for Exeter University (both on and off campus) and as such has a wide range of community facilities within the area to serve its requirements. Great attention has been paid to ensuring that the St James Neighbourhood Plan area is included in one ward and this has been achieved here. Its boundaries are well defined by the River Exe and roads.
Exwick	7332	+1.38%	This is an existing 3 member ward, which has strong boundaries on all its sides (the city boundary and the River

			Exe.) Its Southern boundary has been extended to include those properties accessed from Isleworth Road. There is a strong community spirit within the area, focussed principally around the previous village of Exwick and developments in this area. The majority of the area is accessed via the main road which runs through the centre of the ward.
Heavitree	7002	-3.18%	This retains the current Heavitree Ward, which is extended to take in part of the previous Polsloe and Whipton Barton Wards, allowing it to take in all of the area known locally as Heavitree (including the cemetery). It has strong community spirit around the previous village of Heavitree, which has many local facilities which serve as a local hub. It also has strong public transport links to the city centre by both rail and bus.
Middlemoor	7054	-2.46%	This retains the previous St. Loyes ward and is added to by an area of the previous Whipton Barton ward bounded by the railway line, therefore forming strong boundaries to all sides. It has been renamed Middlemoor, which is a locally recognised area of the City. The majority of the residential areas in this ward, are serviced by the main arterial road running through the centre of the ward and also benefits from a railway station within the ward.
Pinhoe	7406	+2.41%	This ward takes in virtually all of the previous Pinhoe ward, whilst taking in part of the previous Whipton Barton ward. It is very much based around the previous village of Pinhoe, which has good community facilities and local recognition. The majority of the ward is serviced via a main road which cuts through the centre of the ward, as well as a railway station.
Priory	7039	-2.67%	This is an existing 3 member ward, which has amended only slightly from its current state, with its boundary with the Topsham ward being moved to the centre of the main arterial

			road (Topsham Road). This together with its other boundaries of river and roads, gives a very strong definition to the area. There are two distinct communities within the ward (both of which have strong local identities and are served well by good community facilities and public transport), with also some connectivity between the two.
Riverside	7467	+3.25%	This ward takes in the majority of the City Centre and its local and city-wide facilities. It has strong boundaries with them being easily defined by river, road or railway line. It also brings both sides of the Quay community together in one ward, therefore strengthening this aspect of riverside living. There are local community facilities at both the Quay and also in the St David's area of the proposed ward..
Magdalen	7062	-2.35%	This ward takes in all of the previous Newtown ward as well as the majority of the previous St Leonard's ward. It brings together all of the outer city centre area and is served by local community facilities based around the Magdalen Road and Newtown areas. The ward takes its name from the main road running through the centre of it.
St Thomas	7477	+3.39%	This ward takes in all of the existing St Thomas ward, but now also takes in the area known locally as Higher St Thomas, and which looks to use the local facilities of St Thomas. This is one of the strongest local communities within the City. It has good public transport links with the City Centre, including a railway station.
Stoke Hill	7211	-0.29%	This takes in the previous Pennsylvania ward, which is extended to take in all of the properties which are accessed from both sides of Pinhoe Road. The ward has been renamed to take account of the strong community based around the Stoke Hill area of the City with its boundaries being very distinctly defined by roads and the City limits.
Topsham	7231	-0.01%	This is an existing 2 member ward which has been only slightly amended from its current state (as detailed above in

			<p>the Priory description) and, as such, retains its very strong boundaries of city limits, rivers and roads.</p> <p>There are two distinct communities within this ward – one very much based around the historic town of Topsham (and all the facilities that brings) with the second very much still in the development stage. Both communities are well served by public transport, including rail stops in both.</p> <p>The smaller community within the Southbrook area of the City remains connected with the remainder of the ward by a main arterial road to the City and public transport.</p>
Whipton	7191	-0.57%	<p>This ward covers all of the area previously covered by the Mincinglake ward, but now includes the area to the South of the Whipton Village centre bounded by the railway line and roads. This allows for the strong local community around the previous village centre of Whipton to be enhanced in this area. There is a further strong local community around the Beacon Lane area of the City.</p>

Plan 1c - Proposed Ward Numbers

<u>Ward Name</u>	<u>2015 Electorate</u>	<u>Variance</u>		<u>2020 Electorate</u>	<u>Variance</u>
Alphington	6512	-2.34%		6970	-3.62%
Duryard	7288	9.30%		7571	4.69%
Exwick	7255	8.80%		7332	1.38%
Heavitree	7002	5.01%		7002	-3.18%
Magdalen	6647	-0.31%		7062	-2.35%
Middlemoor	6606	-0.93%		7054	-2.46%
Pinhoe	4897	-26.56%		7406	2.41%
Priory	6669	0.01%		7039	-2.67%
Riverside	6911	3.64%		7467	3.25%
St. Thomas	7463	11.92%		7477	3.39%
Stoke Hill	7045	5.65%		7211	-0.29%
Topsham	5255	-21.19%		7231	-0.01%
Whipton	7130	6.93%		7191	-0.57%

Proposal 1 - Ward Boundaries



↑ Proposal 1 - New Ward Boundaries
© Crown copyright Exeter City Council 100049053
Exeter City Council, Civic Centre, Paris Street, Exeter, EX1 1NN
Based upon the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office (c) Crown copyright.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Annex

SEATING IN THE GUILDHALL

		Deputy Lord Mayor Councillor Newby (C)	Chief Executive & Growth Director	Lord Mayor Councillor Prowse (C)	Corporate Manager Democratic/Civic Support	Corporate Manager Legal	
--	--	---	--	---	---	-------------------------------	--

Democratic Services Manager (Committees)				Deputy Chief Executive	Assistant Director Finance	
---	--	--	--	---------------------------	----------------------------------	--

Councillors	Councillors	Councillors		Councillors	Councillors
George (L)	Robson (L)	Edwards (L)		Leadbetter (C)	Fullam (LD)
Crew (L)	Sheldon (L)	Sutton (L)		Baldwin (C)	Mrs Brock (LD)
Williams (L)	Spackman (L)	Hannaforde (L)		Henson (C)	Mitchell (LD)
Laws (L)	Raybould (L)	Pearson (L)	TABLE	Shiel (C)	Donovan (C)
Dawson (L)	Lyons (L)	Owen (L)		Winterbottom (C)	Holland (C)
Clark (L)	Foggin (L)	Denham (L)			Mottram (C)
Bowkett (L)					

Cllr Tippins (L)	Cllr Morris (L)	Cllr Branston (L)	Cllr Brimble (L)	Cllr Bull (L)	Cllr Wardle (L)	Cllr Bialyk (L)	Cllr Choules (L)
------------------------	-----------------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------	--------------------	--------------------	---------------------

L: Labour : 27
 C: Conservative : 10
 LD: Liberal Democrat : 3

Portfolio Holders

Edwards: Leader
 Sutton : Deputy Leader and City Development
 Denham: Economy and Culture
 Hannaforde : Housing and Customer Access
 Owen: Environment, Health and Wellbeing
 Pearson: Enabling Services

This page is intentionally left blank