

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

**CABINET**

**20 JANUARY, 2011**

**REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

**BOUNDARY REVIEW – POSSIBLE FUTURE ELECTORAL OR PRINCIPAL AREA BOUNDARY  
REVIEW OF CANNOCK CHASE DISTRICT AREA**

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To establish if Cabinet wishes to express an interest in the Local Government Boundary Commission for England undertaking an electoral review or principal area boundary review (PABR) of the Council's external boundaries.

**2. Recommendations**

- 2.1 That Cabinet determines whether it wishes to make a formal approach to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to express an interest in holding initial discussions with Commission in respect of:
- (a) An electoral review of the Cannock Chase District Council area; or
  - (b) A principal area boundary review (PABR) of the Council's external boundaries.

**3. Summary (including overview of relevant background)**

- 3.1 The Leader of the Council has received a letter from the Chair of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) in respect of the Commission's current consultation on its general approaches to both electoral reviews and principal area boundary reviews (PABR's). In addition to inviting the Leader of the Council to respond to the consultations, the LGBCE is also seeking to determine if the Council is interested in the Commission undertaking an electoral review or PABR, in order that it can plan its work programme for forthcoming years.
- 3.2 The LGBCE recognises that local authorities are considering innovative ways of maintaining high quality services at a time of reduced funding, and it has the powers to assist Councils to improve service delivery in a number of ways from, for example, correcting minor boundary anomalies to whole Council mergers or reviewing the number of elected representatives on a Council.
- 3.3 A copy of the LGBCE letter to the Leader of the Council is attached as an Annex to this report.

**4. Key Issues and Implications**

- 4.1 Generally, electoral reviews are undertaken where electoral imbalances have grown since the last periodic review was undertaken. In the case of Cannock Chase District Council, this was in 2000. An electoral review would be required to be carried out if the Council was considering reducing the number of elected Members, as changes to the number of Councillors can only be implemented through an electoral review.
- 4.2 A principal area boundary review (PABR) might be required in areas where there are apparent boundary anomalies that impact on efficient service delivery, or where, for example, community boundaries are indistinct.

**5. Conclusions and Reason(s) for Recommendation(s)**

- 5.1 All local authorities are having to consider innovative ways of maintaining high quality services at a time of reduced funding. The LGBCE has the powers to assist Councils to improve service delivery in a number of ways arising from an electoral review, which would be required to change the number of elected Members, or a principal area boundary review (PABR) of the Council's external boundaries, which might help to make service delivery more efficient and effective.

**6. Other Options Considered**

- 6.1 No other options have been considered at this time.

**7. Report Author**

Steve Partridge (Democratic Services Manager), ext. 4588

**REPORT INDEX**

<b>Contribution to Council Priorities (i.e. CHASE, Corporate Plan)</b>	<b>Section 1</b>
<b>Contribution to Promoting Community Engagement</b>	<b>Section 2</b>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<b>Section 3</b>
<b>Legal Implications</b>	<b>Section 4</b>
<b>Human Resource Implications</b>	<b>Section 5</b>
<b>Section 17 (Crime Prevention) Implications</b>	<b>Section 6</b>
<b>Human Rights Act Implications</b>	<b>Section 7</b>
<b>Data Protection Act Implications</b>	<b>Section 8</b>
<b>Risk Management Implications</b>	<b>Section 9</b>
<b>Equality and Diversity Implications</b>	<b>Section 10</b>
<b>List of Background Papers</b>	<b>Section 11</b>
<b>Report History</b>	<b>Section 12</b>
<b>Annexes to the Report i.e. copies of correspondence, plans etc.</b>	

## **Section 1**

### **Contribution to Council Priorities (i.e. CHASE, Corporate Priorities)**

The Council, through its democratic process, contributes to the each of the Council's strategic objectives, represented by the acronym CHASE.

## **Section 2**

### **Contribution to Promoting Community Engagement**

There are no identified contributions to promoting community engagement arising from this report at the present time.

## **Section 3**

### **Financial Implications**

There are no identifiable Financial Implications arising from this report at the present time.

## **Section 4**

### **Legal Implications**

There are no identifiable Legal Implications arising from this report at the present time.

## **Section 5**

### **Human Resource Implications**

There are no identifiable Human Resource implications arising from this report at the present time.

## **Section 6**

### **Section 17 (Crime Prevention) Implications**

There are no identifiable implications in respect of Section 17 (Crime Prevention) arising from this report.

## **Section 7**

### **Human Rights Act Implications**

There are no identifiable implications in respect of Human Rights Act arising from this report.

## **Section 8**

### **Data Protection Act Implications**

There are no identifiable implications in respect of Data Protection Act arising from this report.

## **Section 9**

### **Risk Management Implications**

There are no identifiable implications in respect of Risk Management arising from this report at the present time.

## **Section 10**

### **Equality and Diversity Implications**

There are no identifiable equality and diversity implications arising from this report.

## **Section 11**

### **List of Background Papers**

None

## **Section 12**

### **Report History**

### **Annexes to the Report**

Annex 1	Letter from Chairman of Local Government Boundary Commission for England to Leader of the Council
---------	---

The ANNEX 1  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England

Cllr Neil K Stanley  
Leader of the Council  
Cannock Chase District Council  
Civic Centre, PO Box 28  
Beecroft Road  
CANNOCK  
WS11 1BG

14 December 2010

Dear Councillor Stanley

**Local Government Boundary Commission for England: future review programme**

As you maybe aware, the new Local Government Boundary Commission for England was established in April 2010. Our key roles are to conduct electoral and structural reviews of local government in England, as well as reviewing the external boundaries of local authorities (known as principal area boundary reviews or PABRs).

As a new organisation, we have taken the opportunity to undertake a review of our policies and procedures and are currently consulting on our general approaches to both electoral reviews and PABRs. You may already have heard of our consultation or seen the consultation papers, but the documents maybe accessed via the following web link:

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/guidance-policy-and-publications/major-consultation-of-english-local-authorities>

My reason for writing to you at this time is twofold. First, to invite you to respond to the consultations. It is important that we receive the views of the local government community on our intended approach to reviews.

Secondly, we would like to gauge your authority's interest in the Commission undertaking an electoral review or PABR of your authority. Given the nature of our work, we need to plan our work programme for the coming years very carefully. We need to balance both the need to review authorities where electoral inequality between wards is high, against any requests from authorities that we commence reviews for other reasons.

Generally, we conduct electoral reviews where electoral imbalances across wards have grown since the last periodic electoral review process took place across England between 1996 and 2004. A change to the number of councillors can only be implemented through an electoral review. In planning our work programme, we would particularly welcome any notice of a formal request to conduct a review from your authority. Should we receive this, we will be in a better position to factor this into our work programme.

When planning any review of your local authority, we must be conscious of your electoral cycle, as the Commission has no power to implement any new electoral arrangements at out-of-turn elections. This will be a significant factor in the timing of any electoral review,

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 3rd Floor Layden House, 76-86 Tummill Street, London EC1M 5LG

Tel: 08703 810153; Fax: 020 7298 6788; [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk); [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

alongside demand from other authorities. We would hope to have initial discussions well in advance of starting any review so you have sufficient forewarning of the different stages of the review, in particular the consultation periods. Furthermore, the Commission would need to consider any such request in the context of our current work commitments.

Many local authorities are considering innovative ways of maintaining high quality services at a time of reduced funding. The LGBCE has unique powers to assist councils in achieving some of those aims such as correcting minor boundary anomalies that can hinder effective service delivery to whole council mergers and altering the number of councillors representing the council. Clearly, this approach will not be right for every authority, but the Commission would be interested to hear from authorities who are considering these kinds of options. Further to this, it is important that we have an early indication of the likely demand for reviews in order that we can balance our work priorities accordingly.

I appreciate that the current economic situation in local government is difficult and that your Council's immediate priorities may lie elsewhere. However, it is clear that a number of councils across England are of the view that an electoral or principal area boundary review can help, in the medium to long term, to make the necessary savings that councils up and down the country will be required to make over the coming years. Furthermore, the Commission remains committed to reviewing those authorities where electoral imbalances have grown significantly in recent years. While potentially diversifying the types of reviews we may undertake, the need to provide fair and democratic electoral arrangements remains our priority. We would therefore welcome the information requested at the earliest opportunity in order that we can prioritise review areas effectively.

Any correspondence should be sent to the following address:

Consultation Response  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76-86 Turnmill Street  
London  
EC1M 5LG

Should you have any questions on this or the wider work of the Commission please do not hesitate to contact Archie Gall (Director of Reviews) at [archiegall@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:archiegall@lgbce.org.uk) (Tel: 020 7664 8509)

Yours sincerely,



**Max Caller CBE**

Chair of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England.

Copied to: Mr Stephen Brown, Chief Executive

<u>POLLING DISTRICT</u>		<u>CCDC COUNCILLORS</u>	<u>CURRENT ELECTORATE SCC at 01/09/2010</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER CCDC CLLR</u>	<u>% VARIANCE FROM CCDC AVERAGE</u>	<u>PROJECTED ELECTORATE SCC at 2016</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER CCDC CLLR</u>	<u>% VARIANCE FROM CCDC AVERAGE</u>
AG1	Hagley	STANLEY, N.K.	884			845		
AG2	Hagley	WILLIAMS, A.	2,046	1,718	-6.22%	2,069	1,731	-7.57%
AG3	Hagley		505			548		
BR1	Brereton & Ravenhill		1,065			1,198		
BR2	Brereton & Ravenhill	EASTON, Mrs. D.M.	1,099			1,099		
BR3	Brereton & Ravenhill	EASTON, R.	1,340	1,683	-8.08%	1,285	1,792	-4.30%
BR4	Brereton & Ravenhill	MOLINEUX, G.N.	520			565		
BR5	Brereton & Ravenhill		1,026			1,230		
CE1	Cannock East		1,165			1,118		
CE2	Cannock East	DAVIS, Mrs. M.A.	1,979			2,020		
CE3	Cannock East	MITCHELL, Mrs. C.	402	1,851	1.05%	384	1,840	-1.77%
CE4	Cannock East	THOMAS, D.	940			911		
CE5	Cannock East		1,066			1,086		
CN1	Cannock North	ALCOTT, G.	1,174			1,169		
CN2	Cannock North	ALLEN, F.W.C.	1,517	1,796	-1.91%	1,518	1,834	-2.09%
CN3	Cannock North	DIXON, D.I.	1,624			1,723		
CN4	Cannock North		1,074			1,091		
CS1	Cannock South		784			1,145		
CS2	Cannock South	GREEN, M.R.	9			9		
CS3	Cannock South	KRAUJALIS, J.T.	1,759	1,856	1.35%	1,721	2,012	7.45%
CS4	Cannock South	MORGAN, C.W.J.	1,493			1,546		
CS5	Cannock South		1,523			1,616		
CW1	Cannock West		676			652		
CW2	Cannock West	BENNETT, Mrs. D.J.	1,476			1,478		
CW3	Cannock West	FREEMAN, M.P.	1,807	1,885	2.93%	1,854	1,921	2.59%
CW4	Cannock West	SUTTON, Mrs. H.M.	1,264			1,314		
CW5	Cannock West		432			466		
EH1	Etching Hill & The Heath		1,927			1,894		
EH2	Etching Hill & The Heath	DAVIES, D.N.	511			470		
EH3	Etching Hill & The Heath	JONES, R.	2,486	1,792	-2.15%	2,477	1,757	-6.20%
EH4	Etching Hill & The Heath	WILLIAMS, B.	244			231		
EH5	Etching Hill & The Heath		208			198		
GH1	Hednesford Green Heath	ADAMSON, G.	1,869	1,957	6.83%	1,909	2,036	8.69%
GH2	Hednesford Green Heath	YATES, Ms. W.	2,044			2,162		
HG1	Hawks Green	BERNARD, Mrs. A.F.	1,445			1,441		
HG2	Hawks Green	BERNARD, J.D.	1,438	1,891	3.26%	1,499	1,927	2.89%
HG3	Hawks Green	SUTHERLAND, M.	2,790			2,841		



<u>POLLING DISTRICT</u>		<u>CCDC COUNCILLORS</u>	<u>CURRENT ELECTORATE SCC at 01/09/2010</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER CCDC CLLR</u>	<u>% VARIANCE FROM CCDC AVERAGE</u>	<u>PROJECTED ELECTORATE SCC at 2016</u>	<u>AVERAGE PER CCDC CLLR</u>	<u>% VARIANCE FROM CCDC AVERAGE</u>
HH1	Heath Hayes East & Wimblebury	COLLIS, C.	848			811		
HH2	Heath Hayes East & Wimblebury	ROWLEY, J.	1,854	1,663	-9.18%	1,948	1,682	-10.19%
HH3	Heath Hayes East & Wimblebury	TODD, Mrs. D.	1,211			1,212		
HH4	Heath Hayes East & Wimblebury		1,077			1,075		
HN1	Hednesford North		922			978		
HN2	Hednesford North	BURNETT, G.	1,272			1,348		
HN3	Hednesford North	CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. S.M.	1,230	1,841	0.54%	1,207	1,883	0.54%
HN4	Hednesford North	GRICE, Mrs. D.	1,685			1,678		
HN5	Hednesford North		415			438		
HS1	Hednesford South	BALL, G.D.	1,768			1,844		
HS2	Hednesford South	BURNETT, J.	907	2,103	14.83%	901	2,234	19.29%
HS3	Hednesford South		1,531			1,723		
NC1	Norton Canes	BEDDOWS, J.	1,268			1,265		
NC2	Norton Canes	BULLOCK, L.W.	2,255	1,938	5.84%	2,282	1,928	2.93%
NC3	Norton Canes	GILBERT, P.	2,292			2,236		
RR1	Rawnsley		1,869			1,869		
RR2	Rawnsley	ANSELL, Mrs. P.A.	631	1,917	4.68%	638	1,914	2.20%
RR3	Rawnsley	WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. L.	867			855		
RR4	Rawnsley		467			466		
WS1	Western Springs	GROCOTT, M.R.	1,002			1,133		
WS2	Western Springs	MEADEN, R.G.	1,874	1,702	-7.06%	1,847	1,743	-6.93%
WS3	Western Springs	WILLIAMS, Mrs. P.	1,089			1,069		
WS4	Western Springs		1,141			1,180		
			75,086	1,831		76,785	1,873	
SCC AVERAGE ELECTORATE (7 COUNTY CLLRS)			<b>10,652</b>			<b>10,947</b>		
CCDC AVERAGE ELECTORATE (7 COUNTY CLLRS)			10,727			10,969		
VARIATION			0.70%		VARIATION	0.20%		