

# Exeter City Council Electoral Review

Response to the Local Government  
Boundary Commission's Draft  
Recommendations



July 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 warding pattern for the City, and has put forward its draft recommendations based on 13 three member wards.

The Commission has now asked for comments on its proposed Warding patterns for the City. Any group or individual is able to put forward comments on the proposed Warding patterns for all or part of the City. The LGBCE will consider all submissions before it publishes its final recommendations in September. 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. The Council will, in 2018, revert to its normal practice of elections by thirds.

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 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, the Steering Group considered the LGBCE's recommendations with the comments contained in this document best reflected the community identities and interests of the area, whilst ensuring the proposals would deliver electoral equality.

This submission was considered by the Council's Executive Committee on 14 July 2015 and at a Full Council meeting on the 28 July 2015.

The table provided as **Appendix 1** provides a summary of suggested City Council amendments to the 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 behind the City Council's amendments to the proposed warding arrangements including community identities and interests by highlighting local amenities and facilities that may be either a focal point or natural break between communities

John Street,  
Corporate Manager, Democratic & Civic Support  
Electoral Registration & Returning Officer  
On behalf of Exeter City Council.

July 2015.

.

## COMMENTS ON THE LGCBE'S PROPOSED WARDING ARRANGEMENTS

The table below shows the City Council's comments on the proposed warding arrangements which have been drawn up to reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

It is proposed that, with the exception of Duryard and St James wards, all Wards in the City are represented by 3 councillors.

<b>Ward Name</b>	<b>Forecast electorate 2020</b>	<b>Forecast electoral variance in 2020</b>	<b>Evidence and rationale that the proposals meet the 3 statutory criteria</b>
Alphington	7009	-3%	The Council supports the LGBCE's proposals
Duryard (1 member ward)	2501	+4%	The Council retains its position that this area of the City should be represented by just one member as 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. Due to this, the City Council feels that it would be inappropriate to combine it with any other area in the City
Exwick	7347	+2%	The Council supports the LGBCE's proposals
Heavitree	6970	-4%	The City Council proposes a slight change to the recommendations of the LGBCE in that the proposed boundary should be moved so that numbers 16,18, 25 and 27 St Loyes Road be included in the Heavitree ward (rather than being in the Priory Ward). This, it is felt, gives a much more logical boundary by ensuring all properties in St Loyes Road are located in the same ward.
St Loyes	6836	-5%	The Council concurs with the LGBCE's proposal to retain the

			name of St Loyes for this ward.
Newtown & St Leonard's	6982	-3%	The Council supports the LGBCE's proposals
Pinhoe	6650	-8%	The Council supports the LGBCE's proposals
Priory	7455	+3%	The Council does not accept the LGBCE's proposals, as it feels that this existing 3 member ward, should not be amended from its current state. Its boundaries of river and roads, give 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.
St David's	7546	+4%	The Council concurs with the LGBCE's proposals regarding both the ward name and its proposed boundaries.
St James (2 member ward)	5070	+5%	The Council retains its position that this area of the City should continue to be represented by two members as is currently the case. The Council also continues with its view that the existence of the St James Neighbourhood Forum (the first urban Neighbourhood Forum in the Country) should be properly recognised in electoral arrangements, and that this can be best achieved by the retention of the existing St James ward as a two member ward.
St Thomas	7425	+3%	The Council supports the LGBCE's proposals
Pennsylvania	7547	+4%	The Council concurs with the LGBCE's proposal to retain the name of Pennsylvania for this ward.
Topsham	7065	-3%	The Council does not accept the LGBCE's proposals regarding this ward as it feels that the ward has very strong boundaries of city limits, rivers and roads. It continues in the belief that 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,

			<p>including rail stops in both.</p> <p>A further 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. The Council therefore requests that the boundary to this ward remain unchanged but agrees that it would be appropriate for it to be represented by three members.</p>
Mincinglake & Whipton	7613	+5%	The Council concurs with the LGBCE's proposal to name this ward, Mincinglake and Whipton.