

Final recommendations

The
Local Government
Boundary Commission
for England



New electoral arrangements for Cheshire East Council

July 2010

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: 08703 810153

Email: publications@lgbce.org.uk

© The Local Government Boundary Commission for England 2010

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Electoral Commission 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 2010

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and final recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	8
Electoral arrangements	10
Northern Cheshire East	11
Central Cheshire East	19
Southern Cheshire East	21
Conclusions	27
Parish electoral arrangements	27
3 What happens next?	31
4 Mapping	33
Appendices	
A Glossary and abbreviations	35
B Code of practice on written consultation	39
C Table C1: Final recommendations for Cheshire East	41
D Additional legislation to which we have had regard	47

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 Cheshire East to ensure that the authority has appropriate electoral arrangements that reflect its functions and political management structure.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Boundary Committee for England commenced the review in 2009. However, on 1 April 2010 the Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee and is now conducting the review. It therefore falls to us to complete the work of the Boundary Committee.

This review was conducted in four stages:

Stage	Stage starts	Description
Council size	24 February 2009	Submission of proposals to us and our analysis and deliberation on council size
One	12 May 2009	Submission of proposals to us on wider electoral arrangements
Two	3 August 2009	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	10 November 2009	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	15 February 2010	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

Draft recommendations

The Boundary Committee proposed a council size of 82 comprising a pattern of six three-member wards, 18 two-member wards and 28 single-member wards. The proposals were based on the four authority-wide schemes with some modification. Broadly speaking, the draft recommendations would provide good levels of electoral equality.

Submissions received

During Stage Three the Boundary Committee received 201 submissions, including submissions from the Council, the Congleton and Macclesfield Conservative Associations, the Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee and the Crewe & Nantwich Liberal Democrats. The remainder of the submissions received were localised comments, predominantly from parish councils and local residents. In particular, alternative proposals were put forward for the Crewe and Nantwich area, Poynton and the rural east of the authority and Handforth. Furthermore, several

minor proposed changes to the draft recommendations were submitted. All submissions can be viewed on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk.

Analysis and final recommendations

Electorate figures

The Council submitted electorate forecasts for December 2013, a period five years on from the December 2008 electoral roll which is the basis for this review. The electorate forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 1.8% over this period. The majority of this growth is expected in urban areas, such as Alsager, Congleton, Crewe, Macclesfield and Sandbach. The Council advised the Boundary Committee of development that they considered likely to be completed by 2013 which has been included in their estimates. Following recent changes in legislation, we also need to have regard to a five-year forecast from the date of the publication of our final recommendations. We therefore requested that the Council provide a forecast for 2015. Having considered these projected electoral forecasts, we are content that they provide the best estimate that can be made at this time.

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 Stage Three, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve the levels of electoral fairness. The Boundary Committee's draft recommendations were based on elements of a number of warding proposals submitted. Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during Stage Three, and several minor changes have been made to reflect the evidence received.

Our final recommendations for Cheshire East are that the Council should have 82 members, with 28 single-member wards, 18 two-member wards and six three-member wards.

What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Cheshire East Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Cheshire East Council, in 2011.

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.

1 Introduction

1 The Electoral Commission directed the Boundary Committee for England to conduct a review of the electoral arrangements for Cheshire East. The review commenced on 24 February 2009. Subsequently, the Committee wrote to the principal local authorities in the Cheshire East area (the former county and district councils) together with other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on the most appropriate council size for the new council. Following its decision on council size, the Boundary Committee invited the submission of proposals on the warding arrangements for the new council. The submissions received during Stage One of this review informed the Boundary Committee's *New electoral arrangements for Cheshire East Council*, which was published on 10 November 2009. It then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 15 February 2010.

2 On 1 April 2010, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee. We have now reconsidered the draft recommendations in the light of the further evidence received and whether to modify them.

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 achieve good 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 legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations.¹

5 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 Cheshire East?

6 A Statutory Instrument was approved by Parliament on 25 February 2008, establishing a new Cheshire East unitary authority from 1 April 2009. The Order provided for a shadow authority for Cheshire East based on the area of the districts of Macclesfield, Congleton and Crewe & Nantwich. On 1 April 2009, Cheshire East Council was formerly established and took over its responsibilities from the former county and district councils. On 1 May 2008, elections to the shadow authority were held on the basis of the 27 former county divisions for the area, each returning three members.

7 The Electoral Commission was obliged, by law, to consider whether an electoral review was needed following such a change in local government. Its view was that an electoral review of Cheshire East should be undertaken at the earliest opportunity.

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

Following the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) assuming the functions of the Boundary Committee, the LGBCE is now conducting the review. It therefore falls to us to complete the work of the Boundary Committee.

How will our recommendations affect you?

8 Our recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also determine which electoral ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish or town council wards you vote in. Your electoral ward name may change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. If you live in a parish, the name or boundaries of that parish will not change.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

9 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. It is responsible for conducting reviews.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL (Deputy Chair)
Jane Earl
Joan Jones CBE
Professor Colin Mellors

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

2 Analysis and final recommendations

10 We have now finalised our recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Cheshire East.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Cheshire East is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s in the election of councillors. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009², 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 easily identifiable
 - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

12 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over the next five years following the end of a review. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

13 In reality, 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. 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. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

14 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Cheshire East 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

15 Prior to and during the initial stages of the review, members and officers of the Boundary Committee visited Cheshire East and met with officers, members and parish and town councils. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. The Committee received 44 submissions during its initial consultation on council size for the new authority, 60 representations during Stage One, and 201 submissions at Stage Three. All submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of Cheshire East Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk.

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

16 We take the evidence received during consultation very seriously and the submissions received were carefully considered before we formulated our final recommendations. Officers from the Commission have also been assisted by officers at Cheshire East Council who have provided relevant information throughout the review. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance.

Electorate figures

17 As part of this review Cheshire East Council, supported by the three former district councils in the area of the authority, submitted electorate rolls for December 2008, along with electorate forecasts for the year 2013. These figures projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 1.8% over the five-year period from 2008 to 2013. This growth is projected to be concentrated in the urban areas of the authority such as Alsager, Congleton, Crewe, Macclesfield and Sandbach.

18 During Stage One, the Boundary Committee received several comments from respondents querying the electorate projections in areas such as Poynton, Holmes Chapel and Alsager and citing the potential impact of additional residential development and demographic changes in these areas. The Boundary Committee discussed these concerns with the Council. The Council have advised that those portions of potential new developments that they consider likely to be completed by 2013 had been included in their estimates and provided details of the specific development sites involved. They have also provided details of the manner in which they had factored the impact of changes in household numbers and composition into their electorate forecasts.

19 Following recent changes in legislation, we are required to have regard to a five-year forecast from the date of the publication of our final recommendations. We therefore requested that the Council provide a further electorate forecast for 2015. Having considered these projected electoral forecasts, we remain satisfied that our final recommendations will provide for good electoral equality, strong boundaries and reflect community identities. We have therefore used them as the basis of our final recommendations.

Council size

20 The Cheshire (Structural Changes) Order ('the Order') provided electoral arrangements for the new Cheshire East unitary authority. The authority is currently operating with a council size (the term we use to describe the total number of councillors elected to any authority) of 81 members. The Order allocated three members for each ward, based on the historic pattern of Cheshire County Council divisions in the area of Cheshire East, last subject to an electoral review by the Local Government Commission for England in 2000.

21 As the authority is a new council which combines the responsibilities of the former county and district councils, it is necessary to consider the number of members required to provide for effective and convenient local government. Furthermore, it is important to consider this without being bound by the former number of county and district councillors in the area and to consider how the new authority is managed and how it intends to engage with and empower its local communities.

22 At the beginning of the electoral review, the Boundary Committee consulted locally on the most appropriate council size for the authority and received 44 submissions. These submissions included proposals by Cheshire East Council, local Liberal Democrat groups, the Cheshire Labour Local Government Committee, parish councils, along with individual councillors and residents. It is noteworthy that 18 of the submissions received at this stage exclusively raised concerns in relation to unitary ward boundaries. The Committee considered all of the submissions received when formulating its draft recommendations for Cheshire East.

23 There was a lack of consensus in the proposals received during this stage. From the 22 submissions that did indicate a specific council size, proposals encompassed a potential range from 34 to 135 members, of which 20 suggested a council size of between 80 and 100 members. The Liberal Democrat and Labour submissions sought an increase in council size to 90 members, while the Council sought an increase of one member to a council size of 82.

24 In its draft recommendations, the Boundary Committee considered that the Council's proposal for 82 members was supported by the evidence it supplied, particularly the considerations of councillor workload and the internal political management structure of the authority. While other representations, especially those for 90 members, did suggest local concerns about under-representation, the Boundary Committee did not consider that these outweighed the substantial evidence in support of 82 members provided by Cheshire East Council.

25 No further specific comments on council size were received at Stage Three. Therefore, based on the evidence received we have decided to confirm a council size of 82 elected members for Cheshire East as part of our final recommendations. We are of the view that a council size of 82 members would provide for effective and convenient local government in the context of the new Council's internal political management structure and will facilitate the new role of councillors.

Electoral fairness

26 As discussed in the introduction to this report, the prime aim of an electoral review is to achieve electoral fairness within a local authority.

27 Electoral fairness is a fundamental democratic principle, by which each elector in a local authority has a vote of equal weight. It is expected that the Commission's recommendations provide electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

28 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The authority average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the county (286,942 in December 2008 and 291,190 by December 2013) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 82 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 3,499 in 2008 and 3,551 by 2013. By 2015, the electorate is forecast to rise further to 291,964, with the average number of electors per councillor increasing to 3,562.

29 Under our final recommendations, there will be no wards in which the number of electors per councillor will vary by more than 10% from the average across the authority by 2015. Overall, we are satisfied that we have achieved very good levels of electoral fairness under our final recommendations for Cheshire East.

General analysis

30 During Stage One, the Boundary Committee received 60 submissions, including four authority-wide schemes from Cheshire East Council (hereafter referred to as the 'the Council'), Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee (hereafter referred to as the 'Labour LGC'), Cheshire East Liberal Democrats and a local resident. The Boundary Committee also received two additional patterns of warding for the eastern part of the former borough of Macclesfield from the Cheshire East Green Party (hereafter referred to as 'the Greens') and two former independent district councillors.

31 With the exception of the local resident, who proposed a uniform pattern of single-member wards, the authority-wide schemes all proposed a mixed pattern of wards, including both multi- and single-member wards. The Liberal Democrats stated that they had sought to propose a single-member ward scheme, but did not consider it desirable in parts of the south of Cheshire East due to the pattern of communities. Consequently, they proposed three two-member wards in this part of the authority.

32 There was little consensus between the four authority-wide schemes or the two partial authority schemes. While they all sought to use parishes (and polling districts) as the building blocks of the majority of their proposed wards, they also all divided parishes and polling districts to improve electoral equality or to achieve desired new boundaries. In general, they all sought to maintain splits in their warding proposals between the more urban and rural areas of Cheshire East.

33 While the Council, Liberal Democrat and Labour LGC schemes and the partial scheme from the former independent councillors did contain some background information on some areas of Cheshire East, we were not persuaded that the schemes received were supported by sufficiently robust evidence of community identity and interests.

34 The four authority-wide proposals appear to have focused strongly on achieving electoral equality within a +/-10% range, rather than seeking to achieve a balance of all of the statutory criteria. In some instances, the Boundary Committee considered that these schemes, in seeking to reduce electoral variances, included a number of boundaries which would appear to either split communities or not provide sufficiently clear ward boundaries.

35 The two proposals for warding in the north of the authority, from the former independent councillors and the Greens, contained larger electoral variances. As with the other authority-wide schemes, the Boundary Committee did not consider that either proposal included sufficient evidence relating to community identities or interests that would justify such high variances. Due to this lack of evidence, the Boundary Committee did not recommend the adoption of these schemes in its draft recommendations.

36 The remainder of the submissions received were localised comments, predominantly from parish and town councils and local residents. The majority of these representations referred to possible warding arrangements in the Adlington and Handforth areas, with some submissions received in relation to the remainder of the authority. The majority did not provide evidence of community identities or interests in support of their submissions. However, there was some such evidence supplied in submissions from the areas of Handforth, Poynton, Sandbach and Adlington which is discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

37 Given the lack of specific evidence submitted relating to community identities and interests, the Boundary Committee focused on achieving good electoral equality and strong boundaries that would provide for effective and convenient local government. It also visited the area to examine the various proposals 'on the ground'. This led it to recommend a scheme that was based on aspects from each of the authority-wide schemes, as well as incorporating its own proposals (as in parts of the towns of Crewe and Macclesfield). While the Committee focused on electoral equality and the provision of strong boundaries in the absence of supporting evidence of community interests and identities, where local respondents provided strong evidence of community identity, it sought to reflect this in the draft recommendations.

38 After the publication of the draft recommendations, two errors were noted in the report mapping for the Sandbach and Crewe areas, as well as inconsistencies in the ward electorate figures for the Macclesfield area. The Boundary Committee agreed revisions to the draft recommendations for these areas at its meeting on 25 November 2009. The consultation stage on the draft recommendations was extended by two weeks with a closing date of 15 February 2010. All local stakeholders were notified of this change and revised mapping and an errata sheet were inserted into the reports.

39 During Stage Three, the Committee received 201 submissions including submissions from the Council, the Congleton and Macclesfield Conservative Associations (hereafter referred to as 'the Conservatives'), the Labour LGC, the Liberal Democrats and the Crewe & Nantwich Liberal Democrats. There was general support for the draft recommendations. However, in several areas, alternative proposals were put forward, in particular for the Crewe and Nantwich area, Poynton and the rural east of the authority and Handforth. Furthermore, several more minor changes to the draft recommendations were proposed which are discussed in more detail below.

40 The remainder of the submissions received were localised comments, predominantly from parish councils and local residents. The vast majority of the remaining submissions related to the draft recommendations in the Adlington area and (to a lesser extent) the Handforth area. It was clear that the draft recommendations were particularly controversial in these two areas and the Commission has given careful consideration to the submissions received. In the Poynton and Adlington area, we have examined the potential for an alternative proposal that would better reflect local opinion while ensuring good electoral equality. We have also given careful consideration to the alternative proposal from the Council in the Handforth area and the alternative proposals put forward in a number of submissions for Crewe and adjoining areas.

41 We have noted the submission of a local resident to make minor boundary amendments in a number of areas to tie them clearer ground detail. However, in

some cases, this would require the creation of small parish wards which we do not consider would be viable.

42 In formulating our final recommendations, we have borne in mind that there is no consensus in the submissions received with regard to single- or multi-member wards. However, there does appear to be more consensus that the rural areas of Cheshire East would benefit from single-member wards as this would promote effective and convenient local government and avoid combining too many disparate rural communities within each ward. The Boundary Committee also received several comments from local councils and residents during its consultation on council size, which make a specific request for single-member wards to replace the very large current three-member rural ward of Cholmondeley.

43 In general we have sought to reflect broad local agreement in the provision of single-member wards wherever possible in rural areas. However, it should be noted that we have provided for warding patterns, whether single- or multi-member, on the basis of which best meet our statutory criteria in the areas concerned, and separately from the submissions which may oppose or support multi-member wards solely on principle. We have assessed each of these areas on their individual characteristics and pattern of communities. This has resulted in us proposing a diverse pattern of single-, two- and three-member wards in the urban areas of Cheshire East.

44 Our final recommendations are for a pattern of 28 single-member wards, 18 two-member wards and six three-member wards. We consider that our proposals provide for good electoral equality and strong identifiable boundaries while, where we have received such evidence, reflecting community identities and interests. We have also sought to reflect communication links and, where possible, use parishes as the 'building blocks' of the proposed wards. In areas where we have not received substantial evidence of community identities and interests, we have sought to unite areas of common interest and to provide strong and easily identifiable ward boundaries.

Electoral arrangements

45 This section of the report details the submissions we have received, our consideration on them, and our final recommendations for each area of Cheshire East. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Northern Cheshire East (page 11)
- Central Cheshire East (page 19)
- Southern Cheshire East (page 21)

46 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 41–45, and illustrated on a number of large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of key boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are available to be viewed on our website, and have been distributed to the respective council offices and libraries, according to area.

47 It should be noted that the Boundary Committee in its draft recommendations report used forecast electorate variances for 2013. All forecast variances in our final recommendations are 2015 figures.

Northern Cheshire East

Alderley Edge

48 The draft recommendations proposed a single-member ward for the area, coterminous with Alderley Edge parish. The Boundary Committee considered that this best reflected community identities and interests and encompassed a clearly defined community.

49 At Stage Three, there were no objections to the draft recommendations for this area. We therefore recommend that the draft recommendations be confirmed as final. Under the final recommendations, the proposed three-member Alderley Edge ward would have 4% more electors per councillor than the average for the authority by 2015. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Wilmslow area

Handforth

50 During Stage One, the Labour LGC, the Liberal Democrats and a number of local residents all proposed a distinct Handforth ward. By combining the two Liberal Democrat proposed wards in this area, which included part of Finney Green, the electoral variance would be 1% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. This ward, by including a section of the Manchester Road south of the River Dean, would also have improved internal access, ensuring more effective and convenient local government.

51 At Stage Three, the Council proposed combining Handforth ward and the single-member Wilmslow Dean Row ward to the south in a three-member ward. The Council considered that this would avoid 'artificial' boundaries that would divide communities. The Council said that, while a solution to warding arrangements in this area that would satisfy the views of local residents was difficult, a three-member ward would avoid the need to separate the Finney Green area from the remainder of Wilmslow. Its proposed ward would have 4% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the authority by 2015.

52 A local councillor and 19 local residents also opposed the draft recommendations for Handforth. They primarily came from the Finney Green area, which is in the south of the proposed ward, and argued that they have no affinity with Handforth and should be warded with other areas of Wilmslow to the south. Several local residents in the Dean Row area opposed any move to transfer them into the proposed Handforth ward.

53 We have carefully considered the Council's alternative proposal for this area. While providing for good electoral equality, it would result in the whole of the Dean Row area being warded with Handforth which, based on the submissions received, would appear to be even more at odds with the views of the local community than the draft recommendations. On balance, we are not persuaded that the Council's

proposals will provide a better reflection of community identities than the draft recommendations.

54 While we noted the concerns of local residents, we are constrained by the location of this area on the edge of the authority and the need to secure good electoral equality. We also note that the Council recognises the clear and numerous communication links between Handforth and areas in the north of Wilmslow. Based on the evidence received, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for Handforth ward as final subject to one amendment. We propose that the southern boundary of the proposed ward follow the northern perimeter of Wilmslow cemetery and that the cemetery be transferred to Wilmslow Lacey Green ward.

55 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 2 and 3. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Wilmslow town

56 The draft recommendations for this area were based on the Liberal Democrats proposal in the north and the south-east of the town. This would have resulted in three single-member wards, Wilmslow Lacey Green, Wilmslow Dean Row and Wilmslow East, which were projected to have 5% more, 4% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor respectively than the authority average by 2015.

57 In respect of the south-west of Wilmslow, the Boundary Committee were not persuaded that either the Labour LGC or Liberal Democrat proposals for single-member wards in this area contained robust evidence of community identities or interests. In the absence of further supporting evidence the Committee decided against either proposal, in order to avoid the risk of arbitrarily splitting established communities within the town of Wilmslow.

58 Accordingly, the Committee proposed a two-member ward in this area of the town, combining the Liberal Democrat's proposed Fulshaw and Pownall Park & Morley wards. The draft recommendations proposed the inclusion of the parish of Chorley in an expanded two-member Wilmslow West & Chorley ward, which would have strong communication, transport and community links. This ward would have 7% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

59 As stated above, a number of residents in the Finney Green area of the proposed Handforth ward opposed the draft recommendations and expressed a strong wish to be located in wards in the Wilmslow area. The Council also proposed that Handforth and the proposed single-member Wilmslow Dean Row ward be combined in a three-member ward. As outlined above, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. Other than this, the Council supported the draft recommendations for the remainder of Wilmslow town. No further submissions were received in opposition to the draft recommendations for this specific area. We therefore have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final.

60 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 2 and 3. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Knutsford

61 The draft recommendations were for a three-member ward for the town, as proposed by the Council. The Boundary Committee were of the view that this would provide for a strong ward boundary, good electoral equality, and would avoid splitting established communities within the town. This Knutsford ward would have 4% fewer electors than the authority average by 2015.

62 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations for this area. No further submissions were received in opposition to the draft recommendations. We consider that the proposed ward reflects community identities in this area as it is a geographically compact ward broadly coterminous with the built-up area of the town. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) details the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Knutsford hinterland

63 The Boundary Committee recommended a single-member High Legh ward (based on proposals from the Council and Labour LGC), which would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. It also recommended a single-member Chelford ward and a single-member Mobberley ward. Both of these wards were broadly based on the Labour LGC submission. However, amendments were made to accommodate the proposal to include the parish of Chorley in a Wilmslow West & Chorley ward (as discussed earlier).

64 In order to maintain good electoral equality in this area, the Committee proposed transferring the parish of Little Warford. As a result, the Chelford and Mobberley wards would have 7% fewer and 1% more electors respectively than the authority average by 2015.

65 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations. Mobberley Parish Council expressed concern at being represented in a single-member ward given that the current elected representative is an Executive member on the Council and may not have the capacity to effectively represent the community. Plumley with Toft Parish Council expressed a preference to be in the proposed High Legh ward from Chelford ward. However, no supporting evidence to justify this change was provided.

66 We note the concerns of Mobberley Parish Council. However, the status of the elected member in terms of their duties on the Council cannot be a legitimate consideration when we develop our electoral arrangements for the council. On the basis of the evidence provided at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final.

Poynton and Adlington

67 The town of Poynton is located at the north-eastern edge of Cheshire East. In its draft recommendations, the Boundary Committee acknowledged the strong views expressed by some that more rural areas surrounding Poynton with Worth should not be warded with the town. The Committee sought to identify an alternative warding

pattern for this part of the authority that would facilitate a Poynton ward that includes only Poynton.

68 A three-member ward for the town would have 12% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. Furthermore, to adopt this solution would then require the warding of the neighbouring parishes of Kettlethulme, Pott Shrigley and Lyme Handley with the adjacent Sutton, Bollington and Disley wards respectively in order to avoid any significant deterioration in electoral equality for those wards. There would also need to be significant amendments to the wards of Chelford, Mobberley, High Legh and Gawsorth in order to maintain good electoral equality. A consequence of this would be to move away from locally sourced and evidenced warding proposals across the north of the authority. On balance, the Committee did not consider that it had received sufficient evidence to justify such a departure from the locally generated warding proposals it had received.

69 The Committee therefore based its draft recommendations on the proposals from the Labour LGC and Poynton with Worth Town Council. The Town Council provided details of transport, economic and educational links between the town and the parish of Adlington. On balance, the Committee considered that it would be preferable to combine a part of Poynton with Adlington rather than pursuing extensive and potentially arbitrary parish splits in the wider rural hinterland in this area.

70 The evidence supplied by Poynton with Worth Town Council indicated that links are stronger between the west of the town and the parish of Adlington, which supported the Labour LGC's proposed warding pattern for the area. For example, the train line between Adlington and Poynton runs from West Poynton. The A523 also passes through West Poynton and Adlington, whereas traffic running from East Poynton into Adlington relies on less direct B roads. The industrial estate on the outskirts of Poynton also lies alongside the A523 to the south of west Poynton.

71 On the basis of the evidence received, the Committee proposed a two-member Poynton West & Adlington ward, which would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. The Committee also put forward a two-member Poynton East & Pott Shrigley ward that would have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. To the east, the Committee put forward a single-member Disley ward which would have an electoral variance of 2% more electors per councillor, and to the south, a single-member Prestbury ward which would have 1% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

72 At Stage Three, the Council put forward alternative proposals for this area. These would result in Adlington parish being warded with the east of Poynton town and Pott Shrigley parish. It also proposed a two-member Poynton West ward, without the inclusion of Adlington parish. As a consequence of these proposals, the Council also put forward consequential changes to the adjoining Disley ward and proposed the transfer of Kettlethulme parish to Sutton ward to the south. These proposals were also endorsed by the Conservatives.

73 Poynton with Worth Town Council broadly supported the draft recommendations but, as proposed by Cheshire East Council, considered that Adlington should be warded with the east of the town rather than the west and suggested a minor boundary modification between Poynton East and West wards to provide a clearer ward boundary.

74 Adlington Parish Council strongly opposed the draft recommendations. It wished to see the existing warding arrangements maintained and be warded with Prestbury to the south. It also stated that, if this was not possible, it could accept being warded with the eastern part of Poynton parish on the proviso that none of the town itself be included in the proposed ward. These views were echoed by the Adlington Civic Society. A total of 85 submissions were received from residents in the Adlington area objecting to any proposal that would include Adlington with part of the town of Poynton.

75 Sir Nicholas Winterton (former MP for Macclesfield) asked that sympathetic consideration be given to the views expressed by Adlington Parish Council. Disley Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations and wished to be warded with Lyme Handley to its west. Kettlethulme Parish Council also opposed the draft recommendations and wished to be warded with Disley rather than in Sutton ward.

76 We recognise that the draft recommendations for this area have proved particularly contentious. We have given careful consideration to the submissions received and note that the Council have put forward proposals that would result in Adlington being warded with the east of Poynton town and that this reflects the proposals supported by Poynton with Worth Town Council. However, we consider that this alternative proposal would have a significant consequential effect on the warding arrangements to the south and east of the authority, particularly in Sutton ward, for which, as noted below, there is some local support. Furthermore, simply warding Adlington with the east of Poynton would not satisfy the concerns of local residents and organisations in the Adlington area.

77 The preference of Adlington Parish Council and a vast majority of local residents who made submissions that the parish be warded with Prestbury to the south was supported by some evidence of links between the communities of Adlington and Prestbury, including historic, social, religious and agricultural ties. However, a revised Prestbury ward including Adlington parish would have a significant electoral variance. To accommodate this would require the significant re-warding for the eastern and central part of the authority, for which we are not persuaded there is sufficient evidence.

78 On balance therefore, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. We note that Poynton with Worth Town Council provided some evidence of health, educational, economic and transport links between Adlington and the town. Furthermore, we agree with the view of the Boundary Committee that the evidence indicates that these links are stronger between the west of the town and Adlington. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 4. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Macclesfield

East Macclesfield

79 The draft recommendations in this area were based on the two single-member wards proposed by the Labour LGC. This would result in a Macclesfield Hurdsfield ward, which would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015 and a Macclesfield East ward, which would have 3% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

80 At Stage Three, for this part of the town, the Council and the Labour LGC supported the draft recommendations. No comments were received in opposition to the draft recommendations for this area. On this basis, we have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final.

North and Central Macclesfield

81 The draft recommendations for this area were based on the Labour LGC proposals with some amendments to secure more easily identifiable boundaries. For the Tytherington area, the Boundary Committee proposed a two-member Macclesfield Tytherington ward which would have 1% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. The Committee proposed an extension of the proposed ward boundary in the south of the ward to Cumberland Street on the perimeter of the town centre, in order to enable good access between Tytherington and Bollinbrook.

82 The Committee also recommended a two-member ward which would preserve the whole of the town centre in a single ward along with neighbouring residential estates. Under the draft recommendations, the proposed Macclesfield Central ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

83 The draft recommendations also provided for a two-member Broken Cross & Upton Priory ward. This ward would have 2% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. The proposed ward was based on an amended version of the Labour LGC's proposed two-member ward for this area. The ward would use the A537 as a boundary to the south, and the B5807 as a boundary to the east, resulting in a clearly identifiable ward boundary and good electoral equality.

84 At Stage Three, the Council and the Labour LGC supported the draft recommendations for this area. The Council did however propose that the proposed Broken Cross & Upton Priory ward be named Broken Cross & Upton to better reflect the constituent communities of the proposed ward. We have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final, subject to the proposed ward name change put forward by the Council.

South-West Macclesfield

85 The draft recommendations for a two-member Macclesfield Weston & Ivy ward were based on a combination of the proposals in the three schemes proposed by the Labour LGC, the Liberal Democrats and a local resident. However, the Boundary Committee also made amendments in order to use the more identifiable boundaries of the A537 to the north, the B5088 and Ivy Lane in the east and the boundary of the unparished area to the south and west. This Macclesfield Weston & Ivy ward would have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

86 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations but proposed that the ward name be changed to better reflect the communities of the proposed ward. It proposed that the ward be called Macclesfield West & Ivy. The Labour LGC opposed the draft recommendations stating that the ward would combine areas that were different demographically and could result in the more deprived Weston estate not being adequately represented or getting the support its residents required. Seven submissions were received from local residents from the Ivy Farm area of the ward

who objected to the proposals on the basis that the ward contained communities with little sense of shared community identity.

87 We recognise that there is some local opposition to the draft recommendations in this area of the town. However, we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been received to suggest amending the draft recommendations in this area and no detailed alternative warding arrangements were put forward that would maintain good levels of electoral equality and avoid the need for a wider re-warding of the town itself. On balance, we consider that the draft recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria and have decided, subject to the ward name change proposed by the Council, to confirm the draft recommendations as final.

South Macclesfield

88 In the remainder of the town, the Boundary Committee proposed a two-member ward for Macclesfield South in its draft recommendations. The proposed ward would comprise a slightly amended combination of the Macclesfield Thornton and Macclesfield Moss wards as proposed by the local resident. This ward would have good electoral equality and also provide for a strong boundary with good internal communication links. Under the draft recommendations, Macclesfield Moss ward would have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

89 At Stage Three, the Council proposed that the Lyme Green area of the adjoining Sutton parish be included in the proposed Macclesfield Moss ward. It considered that Lyme Green was more urban in nature and that local residents use amenities and services in the town. The Council also proposed that the ward name be changed to Macclesfield South. Sutton Parish Council supported the draft recommendations to keep the whole of Sutton Parish in a single-member Sutton ward (to the south and east of Macclesfield town). While expressing reservations concerning the geographical size of the proposed Sutton ward, it stated this better reflected the community identities of the parish and adjoining rural communities. It expressed its opposition of warding the Lyme Green area of the parish with the adjoining urban part of Macclesfield.

90 The Council's proposals would provide for good electoral equality for Macclesfield Moss ward. However, they appear primarily to be a consequential change to facilitate its proposals in the Poynton and Adlington areas (as discussed earlier). Given our recommendations with regard to the Poynton area, adopting the Council's proposals for this ward would have a negative impact on electoral equality for the proposed Sutton ward to the south of Macclesfield town. It is also noted that the draft recommendations have the support of Sutton Parish Council. Effectively, to accept this proposed change would also necessitate adopting the Council's proposed revisions to the draft recommendations for the entire eastern part of the authority.

91 On balance, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final, subject to the proposed name change. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 5. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Bollington

92 The draft recommendations for this area were based on the Council's proposal for a two-member Bollington ward comprising the parishes of Bollington and Higher Hurdsfield. This Bollington ward would have or 6% fewer electors than the authority average by 2015. At Stage Three, the Council supported the proposals. Bollington Parish Council welcomed the draft recommendations as reflecting local community identities. The proposals were also supported by Bollington Civic Society.

93 On the basis of the submissions received at Stage Three, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Macclesfield hinterland

94 Given the lack of evidence submitted in support of the proposals for this area, the draft recommendations sought to achieve good electoral equality, and provide for good access within the rural ward, together with strong boundaries. As such, the Boundary Committee recommended a single-member Sutton ward based on the Council's scheme (subject to the inclusion of the Lyme Green area of the parish in the proposed ward), which would have 2% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

95 The Committee also proposed a single-member Gawsworth ward (based on the Labour LGC scheme), which would have 10% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015, and a single-member Prestbury ward, which would have 1% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015 and was proposed by both the Council and Labour.

96 At Stage Three, the Council supported the Boundary Committee's proposed Prestbury ward but, as stated above, proposed an alternative Sutton ward which would result in the Lyme Green area of Sutton parish being transferred to Macclesfield Moss ward and Kettlethulme parish being transferred into Sutton ward. Prestbury Parish Council supported the proposed Prestbury ward but requested that Adlington Parish also be located in the proposed ward. As stated above, Sutton Parish Council supported the proposed single-member Sutton ward subject to expressing reservations about its geographical size. Gawsworth Parish Council objected to the transfer of the Gawsworth Moss area of the parish into the wards of Macclesfield.

97 Having carefully considered the evidence received at Stage Three, we are not persuaded to combine the whole of Gawsworth Parish in a single ward. The area of Gawsworth Moss is effectively overspill from Macclesfield town and it is considered that the draft recommendations would provide a better reflection of community identities than the alternative proposals put forward at Stage Three. While we note that for Sutton ward we have maintained the whole of the parish in a single ward, the Lyme Green area is different in nature to Gawsworth Moss in that it is an established community and is not overspill development from Macclesfield town. On this basis, we consider we have taken a consistent approach to these areas and are satisfied that the proposed wards will secure good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests. Therefore, while recognising the differing views

submitted at Stage Three we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final.

98 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in the Macclesfield town area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Central Cheshire East

Congleton

99 The draft recommendations for this area were based on the Council's proposals for two three-member wards of Congleton West and Congleton East (with 3% and 1% more electors per councillor respectively than the authority average by 2015). The Committee noted that the proposed wards provide good electoral equality and clearly defined ward boundaries for the town. The recommendations used a strong boundary through the middle of Congleton, perpendicular to the A527, bisecting the parish into western and eastern halves. It was also noted that these proposals were supported by Congleton Town Council.

100 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations for the town. No further specific comments relating to the proposals in this area were received. On this basis, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the town as final.

101 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 6. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Holmes Chapel

102 The draft recommendations in this area were based on the Council's proposals which provided for a two-member Holmes Chapel ward, which would have 7% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. The proximity of Twemlow parish to Holmes Chapel and the strong transport links between the two provided by the A535 was noted, as opposed to the less direct access from Twemlow into the Brereton ward.

103 At Stage Three the Council supported the draft recommendations but proposed that the ward be renamed Dane Valley to better reflect its constituent communities. No submissions were received in opposition to the draft recommendations for this specific area. On this basis we have decided, subject to the proposed name change, to confirm the draft recommendations as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Odd Rode area

104 The draft recommendations for this area were for a two-member Odd Rode ward, as proposed by the Council and supported by Odd Rode Parish Council. This proposed ward included the parishes of Church Lawton, Odd Rode, Moreton Cum Alcumlow and Newbold Astbury. The proposed ward would have 3% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015. Furthermore, to the north a single-member Brereton ward was proposed which would have 10% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

105 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations as did Odd Rode Parish Council. Betchton Parish Council (in the adjoining Brereton ward) argued that they had greater links with the communities in Odd Rode ward and wished to be transferred to this ward. Brereton Parish Council requested that an alternative name be provided for the proposed Brereton ward to reflect all the communities within it. The Parish Council suggested that the ward name be changed to Brereton Rural.

106 On the basis of the information provided we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. While noting the objections of Betchton Parish Council, to adopt its proposals would have an adverse effect on electoral equality and would require a wider re-warding of this area for which we have received no substantive justification. We have also decided to adopt the alternative ward name of Brereton Rural as part of the final recommendations.

107 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Sandbach

108 There is projected to be significant growth in Sandbach. Accordingly, the draft recommendations proposed a pattern of four single-member wards for the area: Sandbach Elworth, which will have 10% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015, Sandbach Ettiley Heath & Wheelock, which will have 9% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015, Sandbach Town, which will have 10% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015, and Sandbach Heath & East, which would have 3% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

109 At Stage Three, the Council and the Conservatives proposed an amendment to the boundary between Sandbach Town and Sandbach Elworth wards to reflect the Elworth community and move the ward boundary closer to the Elworth village sign. Sandbach Town Council fully supported the draft recommendations and stated that it did not support the proposed amendment put forward by the Council.

110 We have considered the proposed amendment between the proposed Sandbach Town and Sandbach Elworth wards and are not persuaded that it would reflect community identities and interests and notes that it would link an isolated residential road in the Elworth area with Sandbach Town ward. We consider this area should be located in Sandbach Elworth ward. We are therefore confirming the draft recommendations for this area as final.

111 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 7. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Alsager

112 The draft recommendations were for a three-member ward for the town of Alsager which would contain 7% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average projected for 2015. The Boundary Committee was of the view that this would avoid the possibility of unnecessarily dividing cohesive communities and result in a strong ward boundary and good electoral equality.

113 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations for this area. The Labour LGC proposed that the village of Oakhanger in Haslington ward be located in the proposed Alsager ward. They argued Alsager is the nearest large town from which Oakhanger residents obtain services.

114 We have noted the Labour LGC proposals for this area. However, we also note that the village of Oakhanger itself is separated from Alsager by the motorway. While it is acknowledged that residents in the village are likely to use Alsager for local amenities and facilities, we are not persuaded that we have received substantive evidence that would support the proposed change. Moreover, it would require a wider re-warding of adjoining areas for which there is not support based on the submissions received.

115 We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Middlewich

116 In its draft recommendations, the Boundary Committee proposed that the town form a three-member ward, providing for excellent electoral equality and a strong boundary for the ward. The ward would contain an equal number of electors per councillor to the average for the authority by 2015.

117 At Stage Three, the Council supported the draft recommendations for the town. No further specific comments relating to the proposals in this area were received. We have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for the town as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Southern Cheshire East

Nantwich

118 In its draft recommendations, the Boundary Committee considered that the Council proposal to include the parishes of Stapeley and Batherton in Nantwich for warding purposes had merit. The majority of electors in this area reside in the dense residential area that lies within the A5301 ring road, an area contiguous with housing

estates in the south of the parish of Nantwich. However, it was of the view that the boundary through the town proposed by the Council would risk dividing communities in the west of Nantwich and provided poor internal access within its proposed Nantwich South ward.

119 Accordingly the Committee made several amendments to this proposal. The draft recommendations were for a two-member Nantwich North & West ward, which will have an equal number of electors per councillor to the authority average by 2015, and a two-member Nantwich South & Stapeley ward, which would have 8% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

120 At Stage Three, the Council proposed a modification in the centre of the town between the two wards to facilitate its proposed warding arrangements in the more rural wards to the south. It also proposed that Batherton and Stapeley parishes be transferred from Nantwich South & Stapeley ward to Wybunbury ward as it considered this better reflected community identities. It argued that the ribbon housing development on the southern edge of Nantwich town was not part of Nantwich and noted that most children in the area attend schools to the south and not those in the town. The Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations.

121 While we recognise the community evidence provided by the Council, we did not consider that the proposed boundary between the two wards of the town would be sufficiently clear and well defined. We consider that the draft recommendations would also provide a strong boundary along the A51 and avoids splitting communities in the west of Nantwich as in the Council's proposal. Furthermore, given our proposals for warding arrangements in areas to the south of the town, it would not be possible to accommodate the Council's proposals in this area.

122 On balance, we have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. The team therefore recommends that the Commission confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 9A. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Haslington, Wybunbury and Wychwood Park

123 In the draft recommendations, the Boundary Committee adopted a two-member ward for the parishes of Haslington, Crewe Green, Weston, Basford and Barthomley minus that part of the parish of Weston that is in the relatively new Wychwood Park development. This ward was broadly based on the proposals from Haslington Parish Council, the Council and the Liberal Democrats. Under the draft recommendations, the proposed Haslington ward would have 5% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

124 The Boundary Committee also proposed a single-member Wybunbury ward comprising the 10 parishes of Wybunbury, Hough, Chorlton, Blakenhall, Lea, Walgherton, Hatherton, Hunsterson, Bridgemere, Checkley Cum Wrinehill, along with the Wychwood Park development in the parish of Weston. This ward would have 10% more electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

125 At Stage Three, the Council reiterated its Stage One view that the Wychwood Village be located in Haslington ward. It argued that the part of the Wychwood area

in Weston Parish was very different from the gated community located directly on the other side of the parish boundary. The Council's proposed Wybunbury ward would also have an electoral variance of 10% by 2015. The Council also proposed that the Holly Bush Inn area be transferred from the wards of Sandbach to Haslington ward. It argued that this better reflected community identities and interests. It would also facilitate its proposed warding arrangements in surrounding areas.

126 The Liberal Democrats strongly supported the draft recommendations for this area, saying that the recommendations 'admirably' sought to address the conflicting issues of community identity and the need for improved electoral equality. Weston and Basford Parish Council opposed the draft recommendations considering them to not reflect geographical and social differences in the Wychwood area. It opposed the division of the parish between wards and listed a number of community facilities and activities shared by residents of the Wychwood area and the established communities of the parish.

127 Chorlton Parish Council supported the proposed Wybunbury ward as did several local residents who noted that residents of the parish use amenities and facilities in the Wychwood area. Conversely a number of local residents from Weston parish opposed the draft recommendations stating that there were few links between the part of the development in Weston parish and the adjoining gated community.

128 It is clear that conflicting evidence has been received in relation to this area, with strong evidence provided both for and against the draft recommendations. We consider, on balance, that the draft recommendations provide the best reflection of the statutory criteria. From our tour of the area, it was clear that both parts of the Wychwood development share good communication links as well as some amenities and facilities with Chorlton (in the proposed Wybunbury ward). Furthermore, the transportation links are more direct to Chorlton than to Weston. On this basis, and recognising that there is no clear consensus for warding arrangements in this area, we have decided to confirm the draft recommendations as final.

129 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 9B. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Former Cholmondeley ward

130 The draft recommendations were for a Bunbury ward which would have 2% more electors than the authority average by 2015, a Wrenbury ward which would have 5% more electors than the authority average by 2015, and an Audlem ward which would have 8% more electors than the authority average by 2015. All three wards would each return one member.

131 At Stage Three the Council supported the draft recommendations, as did Audlem Parish Council. No submissions were received in opposition to the draft recommendations in this area. We have therefore decided confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Map 1. This is available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Area between Crewe and Nantwich

132 At Stage One, the Labour LGC's, the Liberal Democrats' and a local resident's scheme all proposed a single-member ward for the parish of Shavington, which lies to the south of Crewe. However, there is a residential estate at the northern tip of this parish, which does not have any road access into the remainder of the proposed ward. Accordingly, the Boundary Committee adopted a modified single-member Shavington ward as part of its draft recommendations, which would have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

133 At Stage One, the Liberal Democrats proposed a two-member Wistaston ward and a two-member Cheerbrook ward which would contain whole parishes, have good communication links within each ward, as well as good electoral equality. It would also retain the current boundary with the unparished Crewe area. However, as a consequence of the Committee's recommendation for warding in the Nantwich and Stapeley area, it was necessary to amend the Liberal Democrat proposals.

134 Accordingly, the Boundary Committee recommended amending parish warding in the parish of Willaston and transferring a new Willaston North parish ward into the proposed Wistaston ward. This resulted in the transfer of approximately 400 electors in the north of the parish into the proposed Wistaston ward. This would result in a single-member Cheerbrook ward (which the Boundary Committee renamed Willaston & Rope), as well as an enlarged two-member Wistaston ward.

135 Under the draft recommendations, the proposed single-member Willaston & Rope ward and two-member Wistaston ward would have an electoral variance of 9% and 7% more electors per councillor respectively to the authority average by 2015.

136 At Stage Three, the Council opposed the draft recommendations and proposed that the two wards be combined in one three-member ward with an electoral variance of 8% by 2015. It considered that the proposed Willaston & Rope ward would arbitrarily divide Willaston parish and that a three-member ward would ensure the community was located in a single ward. Both Willaston and Wistaston parish councils supported the Council's proposals.

137 We note that there is a measure of opposition to the draft recommendations in this area. We also recognise that this is a finely balanced issue and that the Council's proposals would provide for slightly improved electoral equality when compared with the draft recommendations. However, we are not persuaded that combining the two wards in one three-member ward would necessarily better reflect community identities and interests. In particular, we consider that the proposed three-member ward, while having some local support, would result in the creation of a rather large and dispersed ward that would not necessarily contain a cohesive community. On balance, we have therefore decided to confirm the draft recommendations for this area as final.

138 Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1, 8 and 9A. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Crewe and Leighton

139 The draft recommendations adopted the Liberal Democrats' proposal for a single-member ward for the parish of Leighton. This ward would have 3,580 electors by 2015 (or 1% more electors per councillor than the authority average) and would also retain the whole parish within one ward, avoiding a split between established communities in the parish. To the south of Crewe, the Committee put forward a single-member Shavington ward which would have 9% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

140 The draft recommendations for Crewe town were primarily devised by the Boundary Committee, based on proposals from the Labour LGC and a local resident. It was noted that most of the locally proposed schemes submitted at Stage One put forward wards that would straddle the main London to Manchester railway line which was felt to provide a very strong barrier between communities in Crewe. The Boundary Committee therefore proposed a three-member Crewe East ward (based on the Labour LGC submission) to the east of the railway line which would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the authority average by 2015.

141 To the west of the railway line, the Boundary Committee proposed a single-member Crewe North and single-member Crewe St. Barnabas ward which would have 2% and 6% more electors per councillor respectively than the authority average by 2015. In the south west of Crewe the Boundary Committee recommended two, two-member wards of Crewe West and Crewe South with electoral variances of 8% more and an equal number of electors per councillor to the authority average by 2015. Crewe South would also include Gresty Brook parish ward of Shavington parish. The Committee also proposed a Crewe Central ward which would have 3% more electors per councillor than the average by 2015.

142 At Stage Three, the Council put forward alternative warding arrangements for the town, which would divide the proposed Crewe West ward in to two single-member wards of Crewe West and Kings Grove with electoral variances of 5% fewer and 10% more electors per councillor. It also proposed a smaller amendment to the boundary between Crewe St Barnabas and Leighton to move a part of the unparished area into Leighton ward. This proposed amendment between Leighton and St Barnabas was also put forward by a local resident. It was argued that this would secure more easily identifiable ward boundaries. The Council also strongly opposed the inclusion of Gresty Brook in Crewe South ward and proposed that it be transferred to the proposed Shavington ward, with amendments to the western boundary of Crewe South to facilitate this.

143 The Labour LGC also opposed the draft recommendations for the west of Crewe and provided an outline of their preferred warding option which shared some similarities, but was not identical to that of the Council. The Liberal Democrats put forward warding proposals for single-member wards for the town. It also put forward an alternative warding arrangement for the east of the town that would breach the railway line and provide for a pattern of single-member wards. It argued that, while railway lines provided strong ward boundaries, there was a limitation to their use in defining communities. Both opposed the inclusion of Gresty Brook in Crewe South ward.

144 We have carefully considered the submissions received and recognise that the draft recommendations for the town have met with some opposition. We

acknowledge the concerns with regard to the electoral arrangements for Gresty Brook parish ward. However, we are not persuaded that this specific area shares community interests with the remainder of Shavington parish to the south. We note, in particular, that it is separated from the remainder of the parish by the railway line and the A500 to its south. While we acknowledge that Gresty Brook would be likely to share the greatest community links with Rope parish to its west this would not achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality. We note that Gresty Brook has clear transportation links into Crewe and electors in this area are likely to use amenities and facilities in the town.

145 We also consider that the alternative proposals for the south of Crewe would not provide for sufficiently clear ward boundaries and would also result in higher electoral variances than the draft recommendations. In conclusion, we consider that the evidence received is not sufficient to warrant us moving away from the draft recommendations in the south and west of Crewe. We therefore confirm the draft recommendations for Crewe South and Crewe West and Crewe East ward as final.

146 We do, however, propose to move away from the draft recommendation in the north of Crewe. We consider that the Council's and the local residents' proposal for a realignment of the boundary between the proposed Crewe St Barnabas and Leighton wards would provide a more distinct ward boundary that would better reflect community identities. The proposed ward boundary under the draft recommendations follows the Leighton parish boundary that has become defaced in recent years as development in Crewe has overspilt into the parish. We have therefore decided to adopt the Council's proposed amendment in this area as part of the final recommendations.

147 Under the final recommendations, Crewe St Barnabas and Leighton wards would have 3% fewer and 10% more electors per councillor than the average for the authority by 2015. Table C1 (on pages 41–45) provides details of the electoral variances of our final recommendations for wards in this area. Our final recommendations are shown on Maps 1 and 8. These are available at our website, www.lgbce.org.uk.

Conclusions

148 Details of our final recommendations are set out in Table C1 on pages 41–45, and illustrated on a number of large maps we have produced. The outline map which accompanies this report shows our final recommendations for the whole authority. It also shows a number of boxes for which we have produced more detailed maps. These maps are available to be viewed on our website.

149 Table 1 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements based on 2008 and 2015 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2008	2015
Number of councillors	82	82
Number of electoral wards	52	52
Average number of electors per councillor	3,499	3,562
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	0
Number of electoral wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

Cheshire East Council should comprise 82 councillors serving 52 wards, as detailed and named in Table C1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

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

151 During Stage Three, some parishes requested changes to parish electoral arrangements, specifically to parish warding and the number of parish councillors. Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Cheshire East Council 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.

152 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we proposed consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Congleton, Gawsworth, Nantwich, Poynton, Sandbach, Weston and Willaston.

153 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Congleton parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Congleton Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Congleton East parish ward (returning 10 parish councillors) and Congleton West parish ward (returning 10 parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 6.

154 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Gawsworth parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Gawsworth Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Gawsworth Village parish ward (returning six parish councillors) and Gawsworth Moss parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 5.

155 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Nantwich parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Nantwich Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Nantwich North & West parish ward (returning seven parish councillors) and Nantwich South parish ward (returning five parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 9A.

156 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Poynton with Worth parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Poynton with Worth Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, one more than at present, representing two wards: Poynton West parish ward (returning nine parish councillors) and Poynton East parish ward (returning nine parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 4.

157 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Sandbach parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Sandbach Town Council should comprise 20 councillors, two more than at present, representing four wards: Sandbach Elworth parish ward, Sandbach Ettiley Heath & Wheelock parish ward, Sandbach Town parish ward, Sandbach Heath & East parish ward, all returning five members. The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 7.

158 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Weston parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Weston Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Weston Village parish ward (returning five parish councillors) and Weston Wychwood parish ward (returning three parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 9B.

159 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 are proposing revised parish electoral arrangements for Willaston parish to reflect our proposed ward arrangements in this area.

Final recommendations

Willaston Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Willaston North parish ward (returning two parish councillors) and Willaston Village parish ward (returning ten parish councillors). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 9A.

3 What happens next?

160 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Cheshire East Council. The changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Parliament can either accept or reject our recommendations. If accepted, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the next elections for Cheshire East Council in 2011.

4 Mapping

Final recommendations for Cheshire East

161 The following maps illustrate our proposed electoral ward boundaries for Cheshire East Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Cheshire East Council.
- **Sheet 2, Map 2** illustrates the proposed wards in North Wilmslow.
- **Sheet 3, Map 3** illustrates the proposed wards in South Wilmslow.
- **Sheet 4, Map 4** illustrates the proposed wards in Poynton.
- **Sheet 5, Map 5** illustrates the proposed wards in Macclesfield.
- **Sheet 6, Map 6** illustrates the proposed wards in Congleton.
- **Sheet 7, Map 7** illustrates the proposed wards in Sandbach.
- **Sheet 8, Map 8** illustrates the proposed wards in Crewe.
- **Sheet 9, Map 9A** illustrates the proposed wards in Nantwich.
- **Sheet 9, Map 9B** illustrates the proposed wards in Weston.

Appendix A

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
Boundary Committee	The Boundary Committee for England was a committee of the Electoral Commission, responsible for undertaking electoral reviews. The Boundary Committee's functions were assumed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in April 2010
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve 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 Commission	An independent body that was set up by the UK Parliament. Its aim is integrity and public confidence in the democratic process. It regulates party and election finance and sets standards for well-run elections

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 12 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 Committee 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

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's *Code of Practice on Written Consultation* (November 2000) (http://archive.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/servicefirst/2000/consult/code/_consultation.pdf) requires all government departments and agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as the Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: The Local Government Boundary Commission for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult at the start of the review and on our draft recommendations. Our consultation stages are a minimum total of 16 weeks.

Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.

We comply with this requirement.

Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.

We comply with this requirement.

Appendix C

Table C1: Final recommendations for Cheshire East

	Electoral ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alderley Edge	1	3,680	3,680	5	3,713	3,713	4
2	Alsager	3	9,588	3,196	-9	9,886	3,295	-7
3	Audlem	1	3,686	3,686	5	3,851	3,851	8
4	Bollington	2	6,723	3,362	-4	6,716	3,358	-6
5	Brereton Rural	1	3,869	3,869	11	3,932	3,932	10
6	Broken Cross & Upton	2	6,554	3,277	-6	6,944	3,472	-3
7	Bunbury	1	3,511	3,511	0	3,645	3,645	2
8	Chelford	1	3,307	3,307	-5	3,299	3,299	-7
9	Congleton East	3	10,656	3,552	2	10,819	3,606	1
10	Congleton West	3	10,797	3,599	3	11,006	3,669	4
11	Crewe Central	1	3,437	3,437	-2	3,683	3,683	3
12	Crewe East	3	10,428	3,476	-1	10,590	3,530	-1

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cheshire East

	Electoral ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
13	Crewe North	1	3,613	3,613	3	3,627	3,627	2
14	Crewe South	2	6,985	3,493	0	7,118	3,559	0
15	Crewe St. Barnabas	1	3,297	3,297	-6	3,449	3,449	-3
16	Crewe West	2	7,536	3,768	8	7,705	3,853	8
17	Dane Valley	2	7,562	3,781	8	7,597	3,798	7
18	Disley	1	3,604	3,604	3	3,622	3,622	2
19	Gawsworth	1	3,212	3,212	-8	3,217	3,217	-10
20	Handforth	2	6,785	3,393	-3	7,222	3,611	-1
21	Haslington	2	6,613	3,307	-6	6,761	3,381	-5
22	High Legh	1	3,528	3,528	1	3,539	3,539	-1
23	Knutsford	3	10,261	3,420	-2	10,247	3,416	-4
24	Leighton	1	3,926	3,926	12	3,918	3,918	10
25	Macclesfield Central	2	6,728	3,364	-4	6,893	3,447	-3

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cheshire East

	Electoral ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
26	Macclesfield East	1	3,535	3,535	1	3,682	3,682	3
27	Macclesfield Hurdsville	1	3,539	3,539	1	3,532	3,532	-1
28	Macclesfield South	2	6,540	3,270	-7	6,592	3,296	-7
29	Macclesfield Tytherington	2	7,176	3,588	3	7,174	3,587	1
30	Macclesfield West & Ivy	2	6,319	3,160	-10	6,449	3,225	-9
31	Middlewich	3	10,550	3,517	1	10,646	3,549	0
32	Mobberley	1	3,604	3,604	3	3,606	3,606	1
33	Nantwich North & West	2	6,912	3,456	-1	7,144	3,572	0
34	Nantwich South & Stapley	2	6,408	3,204	-8	6,545	3,273	-8
35	Odd Rode	2	6,944	3,472	-1	6,888	3,444	-3

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cheshire East

	Electoral ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
36	Poynton East & Pott Shrigley	2	6,485	3,243	-7	6,458	3,229	-9
37	Poynton West & Adlington	2	7,105	3,553	0	7,074	3,537	-1
38	Prestbury	1	3,610	3,610	3	3,606	3,606	1
39	Sandbach Elworth	1	3,652	3,652	4	3,926	3,926	10
40	Sandbach Eitley Heath & Wheelock	1	3,486	3,486	0	3,870	3,870	9
41	Sandbach Heath & East	1	3,579	3,579	2	3,654	3,654	3
42	Sandbach Town	1	3,896	3,896	11	3,910	3,910	10
43	Shavington	1	3,249	3,249	-7	3,251	3,251	-9
44	Sutton	1	3,614	3,614	3	3,619	3,619	2
45	Willaston & Rope	1	3,883	3,883	11	3,889	3,889	9
46	Wilmslow Dean Row	1	3,357	3,357	-4	3,433	3,433	-4

Table C1 (cont.): Final recommendations for Cheshire East

	Electoral ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2008)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
47	Wilmslow East	1	3,306	3,306	-6	3,328	3,328	-7
48	Wilmslow Lacey Green	1	3,717	3,717	6	3,742	3,742	5
49	Wilmslow West	2	7,634	3,817	7	7,645	3,823	7
50	Wistaston	2	7,537	3,769	8	7,637	3,819	7
51	Wrenbury	1	3,654	3,654	4	3,758	3,758	6
52	Wybunbury	1	3,765	3,765	8	3,907	3,907	10
	Totals	82	286,942	-	-	291,964	-	-
	Averages	-	-	3,499	-	-	3,562	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Cheshire East Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the county. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Appendix D

Additional legislation to which we have had regard

Equal opportunities

In preparing this report we have had regard to the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1976 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to the need to:

- eliminate unlawful racial discrimination
- promote equality of opportunity
- promote good relations between people of different racial groups

National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Broads

We have also had regard to:

- Section 11A(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 (as inserted by Section 62 of the Environment Act 1995). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in a National Park, any relevant authority shall have regard to the Park's purposes. If there is a conflict between those purposes, a relevant authority shall attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park.
- Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of the AONB.
- Section 17A of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act (as inserted by Section 97 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). This states that, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in the Broads, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purposes of the Broads.

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England

Layden House
76–86 Turnmill Street
London
EC1M 5LG

Tel: 08703 810153
info@lgbce.org
www.lgbce.org

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament in April 2010. It is independent of Government and political parties, and is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government areas.