
Local Government Boundary Review – Supporting Information

1. Introduction/Background

- 1.1 At its meeting on 23 March 2017, the Council approved its proposed warding patterns and new ward names as part of Phase 2 of the review of the district's boundaries.
- 1.2 As part of the Local Government Boundary Commission's (LGBC) consultation a small number of Parish Councils asked for clarification of some of the future projections which had been used by the Council to support the review. These projections were the subject of consultation with officers of the Boundary Commission before they were formally submitted in early December 2016. However, forecasting the future number of electors is not an exact science and is one that involves a number of assumptions. A new methodology has now been produced.
- 1.3 Since the submission of the forecast figures there have been a number of factors that have led the Council to have to review these. The number of elector figures was taken as at September 2016. The ratio applied to future electors per household was 1.75 at this point. Since submitting the forecasts in December 2016 the number of electors has increased from 124,492 to 130,217 and the ratio has now been revised to 1.8.
- 1.4 Another issue which has necessitated a further review is the Lakeside planning application which was approved on appeal in February 2017 and will see 325 properties built on a site in Theale. Given the ratio of 1.8 electors to each property this would increase Theale's electorate by 585 electors. This would mean that based on the Council's original warding patterns Theale would have a tolerance level of +22%. This is not an acceptable position. There was also a planning application allowed on appeal in North Newbury but this decision has not impacted on the approved tolerance levels.
- 1.5 Finally, the Council approved its Housing Sites Allocation Development Plan Document on 9 May and this has helped to provide a degree of clarity in predicting future housing numbers and hence electors.

2. Proposals

- 2.1 The number of proposed changes to the approved warding patterns is relatively small accepting that changes to one ward will impact on another ward. The original submission had four wards in excess of the + or - 10% tolerance level. The new proposals will see three wards in excess of the 10% ratio but in the case of two of these they will only be 11% (i.e. 1% over the tolerance level). The new proposals therefore provide greater electoral equality.
- 2.2 The proposed changes to the warding patterns relate to the following:

Ward	Proposal	Impact	Tolerance
Bradfield	To add Englefield	To remove Englefield from Theale	9%
Burghfield	To add Beech Hill	To remove Beech Hill from Mortimer	11%
Mortimer	To remove Beech Hill	To add Beech Hill to Burghfield	7%
Pangbourne & Purley	To add Sulham and Tidmarsh	To remove Sulham and Tidmarsh from Theale	6%
Thatcham Kennet & Crookham	To add Part of TH2 (Ashbourn/Paynesdown)	To remove (Ashbourn/Paynesdown) from Thatcham Henwick	9%
Thatcham Henwick	To remove Part of TH2 (Ashbourn/Paynesdown)	To add (Ashbourn/Paynesdown) to Kennet & Crookham	9%
Theale	To remove Sulham/Tidmarsh/Englefield	To add Sulham and Tidmarsh to Pangbourne & Purley and Englefield to Bradfield	1%
Tilehurst Birch Copse	To add part of ZTL4 (Warborough Ave)	To delete (Warborough Ave) from Tilehurst Cotswold	-9%
Tilehurst Cotswold	To remove part of ZTL4 (Warborough Ave)	To add (Warborough Avenue) to Tilehurst Birch Copse	-9%

- 2.3 The Local Government Boundary Commission has advised that because of the change in the forecast numbers and other factors outside of the Council's control they intend to conduct a further 4 week consultation exercise commencing on 13 June.
- 2.4 Given the approach from the LGBC the opportunity has been taken to review the Council's previously approved warding patterns to see whether a greater degree of electoral equality could be obtained across those wards that have been impacted by the new forecasts and to propose new proposals as set out in Appendix C. With the

exception of those wards set out above all other previously approved warding patterns remain unaffected or within the approved tolerance levels.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1 The electorate projections used to inform the Council's future warding patterns have been re-appraised based on changes in the number of electors (this has increased from 124,492 to 130,217) and other factors (Lakeside planning appeal) outside of the Council's control.
- 3.2 As a result of the projections being reassessed, it is proposed that the Council take the opportunity to submit new proposals in line with the changes recommended in paragraph 2.2 with all other areas remaining unaffected or within the approved tolerance levels.

4. Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1 The LGBC will be holding a further four week period of consultation starting on 13 June.

Subject to Call-In:

Yes: ☐ No: X

The item is due to be referred to Council for final approval	X
Delays in implementation could have serious financial implications for the Council	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delays in implementation could compromise the Council's position	<input type="checkbox"/>
Considered or reviewed by Overview and Scrutiny Management Commission or associated Task Groups within preceding six months	<input type="checkbox"/>
Item is Urgent Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Report is to note only	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strategic Aims and Priorities Supported:

The proposals will help achieve the following Council Strategy aim:

X MEC – Become an even more effective Council

The proposals contained in this report will help to achieve the following Council Strategy priority:

X MEC1 – Become an even more effective Council

Officer details:

Name: Andy Day
Job Title: Head of Strategic Support
Tel No: 01635 519459
E-mail Address: andy.day@westberks.gov.uk

Appendix B

Equality Impact Assessment - Stage One

We need to ensure that our strategies, policies, functions and services, current and proposed have given due regard to equality and diversity as set out in the Public Sector Equality Duty (Section 149 of the Equality Act), which states:

- “(1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:***
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;***
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it; This includes the need to:***
 - (i) remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic;***
 - (ii) take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it;***
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it, with due regard, in particular, to the need to be aware that compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.***
- (2) The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities.***
- (3) Compliance with the duties in this section may involve treating some persons more favourably than others.”***

The following list of questions may help to establish whether the decision is relevant to equality:

- Does the decision affect service users, employees or the wider community?
- (The relevance of a decision to equality depends not just on the number of those affected but on the significance of the impact on them)
- Is it likely to affect people with particular protected characteristics differently?
- Is it a major policy, or a major change to an existing policy, significantly affecting how functions are delivered?
- Will the decision have a significant impact on how other organisations operate in terms of equality?
- Does the decision relate to functions that engagement has identified as being important to people with particular protected characteristics?
- Does the decision relate to an area with known inequalities?
- Does the decision relate to any equality objectives that have been set by the council?

Please complete the following questions to determine whether a full Stage Two, Equality Impact Assessment is required.

What is the proposed decision that you are asking the Council to make:	To approve new warding patterns which impact on 9 wards.
Summary of relevant legislation:	The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 regulates how the LGBC must conduct reviews of Districts.
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?	N/A
Name of assessor:	Andy Day
Date of assessment:	15 May 2017

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	No
Strategy	No	Already exists and is being reviewed	No
Function	No	Is changing	No
Service	No		

1. What are the main aims, objectives and intended outcomes of the proposed decision and who is likely to benefit from it?	
Aims:	To provide a Council proposal to inform the LGBC review of the District.
Objectives:	To achieve a smaller Council size in terms of the number of Members elected.
Outcomes:	To achieve a Council size of 42 + or - 1 for the 2019/20 District Council elections.
Benefits:	Given the Council's financial position this proposal will contribute to the Council becoming more efficient.

2. Note which groups may be affected by the proposed decision. Consider how they may be affected, whether it is positively or negatively and what sources of information have been used to determine this.

(Please demonstrate consideration of all strands – Age, Disability, Gender Reassignment, Marriage and Civil Partnership, Pregnancy and Maternity, Race, Religion or Belief, Sex and Sexual Orientation.)

Group Affected	What might be the effect?	Information to support this
Age	N/A	This review will seek to reduce the number of Councillors from 52 to 42. This proposal is not expected to impact on any of the groups with protected characteristics more than anyone else.
Disability	N/A	As above
Gender Reassignment	N/A	As above
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A	As above
Pregnancy and Maternity	N/A	As above
Race	N/A	As above
Religion or Belief	N/A	As above
Sex	N/A	As above
Sexual Orientation	N/A	As above
Further Comments relating to the item:		

3. Result

Are there any aspects of the proposed decision, including how it is delivered or accessed, that could contribute to inequality?

No

Please provide an explanation for your answer:

Will the proposed decision have an adverse impact upon the lives of people, including employees and service users?

No

Please provide an explanation for your answer: The Council is looking to reduce the number of Members that are elected every four years. Whilst the number of electors per Councillor will increase residents will still have to support from an elected representative.

If your answers to question 2 have identified potential adverse impacts and you have answered 'yes' to either of the sections at question 3, or you are unsure about the impact, then you should carry out a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment.

If a Stage Two Equality Impact Assessment is required, before proceeding you should discuss the scope of the Assessment with service managers in your area. You will also need to refer to the [Equality Impact Assessment guidance and Stage Two template](#).

4. Identify next steps as appropriate:	
Stage Two required	No
Owner of Stage Two assessment:	
Timescale for Stage Two assessment:	

Name: Andy Day

Date: 15 May 2017

Please now forward this completed form to Rachel Craggs, Principal Policy Officer (Equality and Diversity) (rachel.craggs@westberks.gov.uk), for publication on the WBC website.