
Boundary Review - Response to the LGBCs Draft Proposals - Summary Report

Committee considering report:	Council
Date of Committee:	31 October 2017
Portfolio Member:	Councillor Graham Jones
Date Portfolio Member agreed report:	19 October 2017
Report Author:	Andy Day
Forward Plan Ref:	C3399

1. Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 To set out the Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's proposed changes to the District's warding patterns from the 2019/20 District Council Elections.

2. Recommendation

- 2.1 Council is requested to approve the proposed changes to the following wards (set out below and in more detail in Appendix B) as the Council's formal response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's review of the Council's warding patterns.
- (i) Bucklebury and Aldermaston (Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.6)
 - (ii) Hungerford and Kintbury (Paragraph 3.7)
 - (iii) Basildon and Compton (Paragraph 3.8)
 - (iv) Wash Common, Newbury Central and Greenham (Paragraphs 3.9 to 3.21)
 - (v) Thatcham Central and Crookham (Paragraphs 3.22 to 3.25)
 - (vi) Purley and Tilehurst (Paragraphs 3.26 to 3.29)
 - (vii) Florence Gardens (Paragraph 3.30)

3. Implications

- 3.1 **Financial:** N/A
- 3.2 **Policy:** N/A
- 3.3 **Personnel:** N/A
- 3.4 **Legal:** This review is being conducted in accordance with the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009

3.5 Risk Management: N/A

3.6 Property: N/A

Executive Summary

4. Introduction

4.1 On 29 August 2017 the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) published a set of draft recommendations for changes to the Council's warding patterns with effect from 2019/20 District Council elections. These recommendations proposed:

- (i) 43 Councillors, nine fewer than there are now.
- (ii) 20 wards, 10 fewer than there are now.
- (iii) The boundaries of one ward staying the same.

4.2 The original consultation period was 29 August to 6 November 2017 (10 weeks). However, an error was identified in the LGBC's calculations for the proposed new Wash Common ward and, in order to correct these figures, the consultation period has been extended to 13 November.

5. Proposal

5.1 The Boundary Review Steering Group met on 12 October 2017 to consider the Council's response to the LGBC's proposals. The Steering Group had concerns about a number of the proposed 3 Member wards and has accordingly prepared counter proposals in some cases. These are set out below along with a number of other suggested changes:

- (i) Bucklebury and Aldermaston
- (ii) Hungerford and Kintbury
- (iii) Basildon and Compton
- (iv) Newbury Central, Wash Common, and Greenham areas
- (v) Thatcham Central and Crookham
- (vi) Purley and Tilehurst

6. Conclusion

6.1 The Steering Group has reviewed the LGBC's proposed warding patterns and has formulated counter proposals for the Bucklebury and Aldermaston ward, Hungerford and Kintbury ward, Newbury Central, Wash Common and Greenham wards, Basildon and Compton ward, Thatcham Central and Crookham ward and Purley and Tilehurst ward.

7. Appendices

7.1 Appendix A – Equalities Impact Assessment

7.2 Appendix B – Supporting Information

Appendix A

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 Executive to make:	To respond to the LGBCs consultation on proposed warding patterns post 2019/20.
Summary of relevant legislation:	The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009
Does the proposed decision conflict with any of the Council's key strategy priorities?	No
Name of assessor:	Andy Day
Date of assessment:	28 September 2017

Is this a:		Is this:	
Policy	No	New or proposed	
Strategy	Yes	Already exists and is being reviewed	Yes
Function	No	Is changing	
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 have the Local Government Boundary Commission undertake a Council Size review of the District in time for the 2019/20 District Council elections.
Objectives:	To have had the warding patterns reviewed independently with a view to the number of councillors being reduced to 42+ or - 1.
Outcomes:	To ensure that the Council has the appropriate number of councillors elected from 2019/20 District Council elections based on a review of the warding patterns.
Benefits:	To ensure that the electorate is appropriately represented.

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	
Disability	N/A	
Gender Reassignment	N/A	
Marriage and Civil Partnership	N/A	
Pregnancy and Maternity	N/A	
Race	N/A	
Religion or Belief	N/A	
Sex	N/A	
Sexual Orientation	N/A	
Further Comments relating to the item:		
Any proposals adopted by the LGBC have to show a degree of electoral equality so this review will actually improve representation of all electors.		

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: The review is looking at ward boundaries to achieve a reduced number of councillors whilst improving electoral equality. Electors will still be represented albeit by fewer councillors.	
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 review is looking at ward boundaries to achieve a reduced number of councillors whilst improving electoral equality. Electors will still be represented albeit by fewer councillors.	

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: 18 October 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.