



GA.41 15/16

Committee  
Governance and Audit

19 January 2016

C

**Subject: County Council Boundary Review**

Report by:

Director of Resources

Contact Officer:

Alan Robinson  
Monitoring Officer  
Telephone 01427 676509  
Email alan.robinson@west-lindsey.gov.uk

Purpose / Summary:

To allow the Governance and Audit Committee to discuss the Boundary Commission's draft recommendations with regard to the ongoing County Council Boundary review with a view to making recommendations to Full Council.

**RECOMMENDATION(S): That Members consider the finding of the Boundary Commission and make RECOMMENDATIONS to Council to Delegate Responsibility to the Director of Resources to write to the Commission to either**

- a) Confirm agreement with the findings
- b) Reiterate the contents of the letter sent to the commission in terms of the matching of West Lindsey Boundaries where possible and retain 10 County division
- c) To provide detailed feedback and specific suggestions regarding changes to the boundaries that are proposed

**IMPLICATIONS**

**Legal: None relating to this report**

**Financial : None relating to this report**

**Staffing : none relating to this report**

**Equality and Diversity including Human Rights :**  
*NB: Please explain how you have considered the policy's impact on different groups (for example: young people, elderly, ethnic minorities, LGBT community, rural residents, disabled, others).*

**Risk Assessment : NA**

**Climate Related Risks and Opportunities : NA**

**Title and Location of any Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:**

**Call in and Urgency:**

**Is the decision one which Rule 14.7 of the Scrutiny Procedure Rules apply?**

Yes  No

**Key Decision:**

Yes  No

## **1 Introduction**

- 1.1 The Boundary Commission is the body responsible for reviewing and setting boundaries for elections. They are currently reviewing the Boundaries for Lincolnshire County Council Boundaries.
- 1.2 On 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2015 this committee reviewed the consultation documents provided by the Boundary Commission. As a result the Director of Resources was asked to respond to the consultation. A copy of the letter which was sent on 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2015 is attached for your information.

## **2 Electoral Review of Lincolnshire Draft Recommendations**

- 2.1 On the 15<sup>th</sup> December 2015 the Boundary Commission issued its draft recommendations for Consultation. Details of the recommendations are attached.  
Appendix 2 Summary Report  
Appendix 3 Full Report  
Appendix 4 Map

## **3. Areas for consideration**

- There a number of Divisions where the boundaries are different to the West Lindsey Wards and parishes
- The Boundaries are not contained within West Lindsey
- The Rural and Urban split

## Appendix1

Review Officer (Lincolnshire) 11  
January, 2016  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Millbank Tower  
Millbank  
London  
SW1P 4QP

Dear Sir,

### **Electoral Review of Lincolnshire**

I have been asked to write to you behalf of West Lindsey District Council's Governance and Audit Committee in order to feed into your consultation.

The review of Boundaries was debated at the Governance and Audit Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2015. The Committee did not discuss specific areas but instead agreed some broad principals that the committee would like to see reflected in your review and these are detailed below.

- Where possible county council boundaries should reflect current district ward boundaries
- West Lindsey should continue have 10 members as is the current situation
- Divisions should aim to have no more than 8000 electors
- Rural and urban areas which the committee believes are very different in nature and therefore should be kept separate wherever possible.

Thank you for inviting West Lindsey District Council to feed into the review process. If you do require any further information or clarification please contact me.

Yours Sincerely

Ian Knowles  
Director of Recourses

## Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lincolnshire County Council

Summary report

Read the full report, view detailed maps and have your say at: [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)  
Find out more at: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)  
Follow us on Twitter at: [@LGBCE](https://twitter.com/LGBCE)

### Helping you to have your say:

We are now consulting local people on a new pattern of electoral divisions for Lincolnshire. The Commission has an open mind about its final recommendations and will consider every piece of evidence we receive from local groups and people. Every representation will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Lincolnshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of electoral divisions for Lincolnshire which delivers:

- **Electoral equality:** each councillor represents a similar number of voters.
- **Community identity:** reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- **Effective and convenient local government:** helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

### A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

### Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the county?

### Community identity:

- **Transport links:** are there good links across your proposed division? Is there any form of public transport?
- **Community groups:** is there a parish council, residents association or another group that represents the area?
- **Facilities:** does your pattern of divisions reflect where local people go for shops, medical services, leisure facilities etc?
- **Interests:** what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- **Identifiable boundaries:** are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

### Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the electoral divisions appropriate?

### Useful tips:

- Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk).
- We publish all submissions we receive on our website so you can follow what other people and organisations have told us. Go to: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Have your say by writing to:

Review Officer (Lincolnshire)  
LGBCE  
14th floor, Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP

Through our consultation area:

[www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)  
or by email to: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report and interactive maps are available to view at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

Follow us on Twitter: [@LGBCE](https://twitter.com/LGBCE)

### Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

### Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements are:

- The total number of councillors representing the council's voters ('council size').
- The names, number and boundaries of wards or electoral divisions.
- The number of councillors representing each ward or division.

### Why Lincolnshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Lincolnshire County Council to deliver improved levels of electoral equality for local voters.

Lincolnshire currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some county councillors represent many more - or many fewer - voters than others. This means that the value of your vote - in county council elections - varies depending on where you live in Lincolnshire.

### Our proposals

Lincolnshire County Council currently has 77 county councillors. We propose that the council should have 70 county councillors in future. The Commission believes that a council size of 70 will ensure the authority can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively and provides for a pattern of divisions that meets our statutory criteria.

### Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that Lincolnshire's 70 councillors should represent 70 single-member divisions across the county.

### You have until 8 February 2016 to have your say on the recommendations

Stage of review	Description
12 May - 21 Jul 2015	Public consultation on new division boundaries
15 Dec 2015 - 8 Feb 2016	Public consultation on draft recommendations for new electoral arrangements
17 May 2016	Publication of final recommendations by the Commission
May 2017	Subject to parliamentary approval - implementation of new arrangements at county elections




# Overview of draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council

View this map online and draw your own boundaries: [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

Follow the review on Twitter: [@LGBCE](https://twitter.com/LGBCE)

If you are viewing this page online, click on the map to go straight to our interactive consultation area



contains Ordnance Survey data (c) Crown copyright and database rights 2015

## Summary of our recommendations

Our draft recommendations propose that Lincolnshire county councillors should represent 70 single-member electoral divisions.

Before drawing up the draft recommendations the Commission carried out a public consultation inviting proposals for a new pattern of divisions for Lincolnshire. We considered all the submissions we received during that phase of consultation.

The Commission believes that the draft recommendations meet the obligations –which are set out in law –to:

- Deliver electoral equality for voters
- Reflect local community interests and identities
- Promote effective and convenient local government.

An outline of the proposals is shown in the map to the right of this box. A detailed report on the recommendations and interactive mapping is also available on our website at: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk).

The Commission welcomes comments on these draft recommendations whether you support the proposals or if wish to put forward alternative arrangements. In particular, the Commission welcomes proposals for alternative boundaries or division names which meet the criteria we must follow as part of electoral reviews and which are described in more detail over the page.

## Have your say at [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk):

- view the map of our recommendations down to street level.
- draw your own boundaries online.
- zoom into the areas that interest you most.
- find more guidance on how to have your say.
- read the full report of our recommendations.
- send us your views directly.

<b>A</b>	<b>Boston Borough</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>South Holland</b>
1	Boston North	39	Cowbit
2	Boston South	40	Crowland
3	Butterwick & Wrangle	41	Donington Rural
4	Holland Fen & Sutterton	42	Holbeach
5	Skirbeck	43	Holbeach Rural
6	Wyberton & Marshes	44	Moutlon Seas End
		45	Spalding Central
<b>B</b>	<b>East Lindsey</b>	46	Spalding Elloe
7	Alford & Sutton	47	The Suttons
8	Horncastle & The Keals		
9	Ingoldmells Rural	<b>F</b>	<b>South Kesteven</b>
10	Louth North	48	Ancaster & Manthorpe
11	Louth South	49	Barrowby
12	Louth Wolds	50	Baston & Barholm
13	Mablethorpe	51	Belton Park
14	Saltfleet & The Cotes	52	Bourne Croft & Twenty
15	Skegness North	53	Bourne Woodview & Morton
16	Skegness South		
17	Tattershall Castle	54	Colsterworth Rural
18	Wainfleet	55	Deeping St. James
19	Woodhall Spa & Wragby	56	Green Hill
		57	Hough
<b>C</b>	<b>Lincoln City</b>	58	Spittlegate
20	Birchwood	59	Stamford East
21	Boultham	60	Stamford West
22	Carholme	61	Upper Glens
23	Ermine & Cathedral		
24	Hartsholme	<b>G</b>	<b>West Lindsey</b>
25	Park	62	Ancholme Cliffe
26	St. Giles	63	Bardney &
27	Swallowbeck & Witham		Cherry Willingham
		64	Gainsborough Hill
<b>D</b>	<b>North Kesteven</b>	65	Gainsborough Trent
28	Bassingham & Welbourn	66	Market Rasen Wolds
		67	Nettleham
29	Eagle	68	North Wolds
30	Heckington	69	Saxilby
31	Hykeham Forum	70	Scotter Rural
32	Potterhanworth & Coleby		
33	Rowston		
34	Ruskington		
35	Sleaford		
36	Sleaford Rural		
37	Waddington		
38	Washingborough		

# Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lincolnshire County Council

Electoral review

December 2015

## **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: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England 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 2015



# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Division patterns	7
Detailed divisions	9
Boston	9
East Lindsey	10
Lincoln	18
North Kesteven	20
South Holland	23
South Kesteven	26
West Lindsey	29
Conclusions	33
Parish electoral arrangements	33
3 Have your say	39

## Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council	41
B Submissions received	48
C Glossary and abbreviations	50

# Summary

## Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

## Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

## Why Lincolnshire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Lincolnshire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Lincolnshire. Overall, 33% of divisions currently have a variance of more than 10% from the average for the county. The divisions of Lincoln Park and Stamford West have 35% and 34% fewer electors than the average for Lincolnshire, respectively.

## Our proposals for Lincolnshire

Lincolnshire County Council currently has 77 councillors. Based on the evidence received during the preliminary phase of the review, we were minded to reduce the council size by six to 71, and invited proposals for division patterns based on that number.

However, when formulating the draft recommendations we considered that a council size of 70 would provide for a better allocation of members across the districts in the county and achieve a better balance between the statutory criteria. We consider that a reduction in council size by seven to 70 members would not adversely affect the Council in discharging its roles and responsibilities effectively. We have therefore based our draft recommendations for Lincolnshire on a council size of 70 members.

## Electoral arrangements

Lincolnshire County Council elects by wholes. The council has expressed the wish to retain single-member divisions. We have therefore aimed to produce a pattern of single-member divisions.

Our draft recommendations propose that Lincolnshire County Council's 70 councillors should represent 70 single-member divisions across the county. None of our proposed divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Lincolnshire by 2021.

**You have until 8 February 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 39 for how to have your say.**

# 1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Lincolnshire County Council's ('the Council's') electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

## What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. 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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
12 May 2015	Invitation to submit proposals for division patterns to LGBCE
22 July 2015	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
15 December 2015	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation
9 February 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
17 May 2016	Publication of final recommendations

## How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 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.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)  
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)  
Alison Lowton  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation<sup>2</sup> states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors<sup>3</sup> in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 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.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	<b>2015</b>	<b>2021</b>
Electorate of Lincolnshire	558,455	580,447
Number of councillors	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	7,978	8,292

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have electoral variances of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Lincolnshire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Lincolnshire Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

### Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.



## Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district levels and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 4% to 2021.

15 The initial set of electorate forecasts provided by the Council were not supported by all the political groups on the County Council. We received comments on the electorate forecasts being compiled as part of submissions relating to council size. We decided to meet the Group Leaders of the Council to discuss the electorate forecasts and agreed for a revised set of electorate data to be compiled. Having received this revised data we used this as the basis for the invitation of division patterns.

16 During consultation on the division patterns for Lincolnshire it was identified that the electorate data included some anomalies. We informed the Council of the issues identified and they were able to provide us with a further revised set of electorate forecasts that addressed the issues.

17 We are now satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

18 During the preliminary phase of the review we received four submissions on council size. These were from Lincolnshire County Council, the Conservatives & Administration Group for Lincolnshire County Council, the Labour Group for Lincolnshire County Council and Councillor Overton, the Leader of the Lincolnshire Independents. These proposed council sizes of 71, 71, 77 and 75, respectively. As part of the Council's submission they notified us that they had passed a resolution for a single-member division review.

19 We carefully considered the representations received during this preliminary phase. Each of the groups had provided us with conflicting evidence to justify their proposed council size.

20 We decided to meet with the Group Leaders to discuss the issue of council size. Following this meeting we gave the opportunity for the Council and political groups to submit any further evidence. We received three further submissions on council size. These were made by Lincolnshire County Council, the Conservatives & Administration Group for Lincolnshire County Council and the Labour Group for Lincolnshire County Council. They all supported their initial proposals for council sizes of 71, 71 and 77, respectively.

21 Those respondents who proposed to maintain the current council size did not, in our view, provide persuasive evidence that justified their preferred number in the context of the size and geographical nature of Lincolnshire, or detail the appropriate considerations regarding effective governance and decision-making for the authority.

22 We considered that the submission received that proposed a council of 75 was not supported by persuasive evidence to support a council size of 75.

23 Having considered the evidence received, we were of the view that the Council had made a persuasive case to support a reduction in council size. We therefore invited proposals for division patterns for the Lincolnshire based on a council size of 71 members. In response to consultation on division patterns we received five submissions supporting the reduction in council size.

24 We explained to all interested parties from the outset that the council size figure adopted at this stage of the review provided context for local stakeholders to submit their views on the wider electoral arrangements and that this council size figure could be slightly adjusted in order to provide for division patterns that provide a better balance between the statutory criteria.

25 In formulating the draft recommendations we identified that a council size of 70 would allow for a better allocation of members across the county, and provide for a pattern of divisions which would achieve a better balance between the statutory criteria. We are of the view that a council size of 70 would not impact adversely on the governance arrangements of the council. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 70 elected members, allocated across the districts as follows:

- Boston – six members
- East Lindsey – 13 members
- Lincoln – eight members
- North Kesteven – 11 members
- South Holland – nine members
- South Kesteven – 14 members
- West Lindsey – nine members

## Division patterns

26 During consultation on division patterns, we received 65 submissions, including one county-wide proposal from the Council, and five partial schemes. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular areas of the county.

27 The county-wide scheme provided an arrangement of 71 single-member divisions for the county. The five partial division arrangements were one each for the districts of City of Lincoln, Stamford town, North Kesteven and two for the district of East Lindsey. Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of division resulted in good levels of electoral equality in some areas of the county and generally looked to use clearly identifiable boundaries. However, substantial alterations have been made to the schemes to achieve good electoral equality across the county as a whole and reflect a council size of 70 members.

28 Our draft recommendations are for 70 single-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

29 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on page 41) and on the large map accompanying this report.

30 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

## Draft recommendations

31 The tables on pages 9–32 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Lincolnshire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>4</sup> criteria of:

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

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Boston

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Boston North</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the area to the east of the River Witham between Witham Way Country Park, Boston High School and the Boston United football ground. Also the area west of the River between Beech Wood and North Forty Foot Bank.	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We did not receive any further submissions relating directly to this division. The arrangement allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston North West to Boston North to better reflect the area covered by it.
<b>Boston South</b>	1	1%	This division includes the area south of North Forty Foot Bank, and north of South Forty Foot Bank.	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We did not receive any further submissions relating directly to this division. The arrangement allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston West to Boston South to better reflect the area covered by it.
<b>Butterwick &amp; Wrangle</b>	1	4%	This division comprises six whole parishes including Wrangle, Benington and Freiston and parts of Fishtoft.	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We did not receive any further submissions relating directly to this division. The arrangement provides for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston Coastal to Butterwick & Wrangle to better reflect the area covered by it.
<b>Holland Fen &amp; Sutterton</b>	1	3%	This division comprises eight whole parishes including, Holland Fen with Brothertoft,	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We received one submission directly relating to this division from a parish council supporting the inclusion of Holland Fen with

			Bicker and Fosdyke and the northern part of Kirton parish.	Brothertoft parish in a division with Swineshead and Amber Hill as a rural division rather than being included in a division with Boston as an urban division. The arrangement allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston North West to Holland Fen & Sutterton to better reflect the area contained within.
<b>Skirbeck</b>	1	4%	This division includes the area east of Boston College to the Fishtoft parish boundary and beyond to the Bladon Estate.	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We did not receive any further submissions relating directly to this division. The arrangement allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston East to Skirbeck to better reflect the area contained within.
<b>Wyberton &amp; Marshes</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises Wyberton and Frampton parishes, the southern part of Kirton parish and the Skirbeck Quarter of Boston.	The division is based on a proposal received during consultation as part of a county-wide scheme. We did not receive any further submissions relating directly to this division. The arrangement allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Boston South to Wyberton & Marshes to better reflect the area covered by it.

### East Lindsey

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Alford &amp; Sutton</b>	1	0%	This division comprises five whole parishes including Hannah cum Hagby, Rigsby with Ailby and Farlesthorne, also the southern end of	We received four division patterns for this part of East Lindsey. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. Three of the four patterns proposed the same division boundary; this has been included as part of the draft recommendations. The

			Mablethorpe & Sutton parish. It is bounded by the sea to the east.	electoral equality is good, and parish boundaries have been used to reflect existing community identities. The name remains the same.
<b>Horncastle &amp; the Keals</b>	1	-2%	This division includes 17 whole parishes including Hundleby, Low Toynton, Haltham and East Keal. Also the northern extents on Mareham le Fen and Revesby.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. Two further submissions were also received relating to specific areas. One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based.</p> <p>One submission proposed that the villages of Hundleby and Spilsby should be included in the same division, and whilst it is evident on the ground that the two are connected, it is not possible to achieve this and maintain a good level of electoral equality. The division boundary is coterminous with the ward boundary in this area.</p> <p>A second submission proposed that the Keals, Kirkby, Stickney and Stickford should be grouped within the same division. Our investigations indicated that including all these parishes in the same division would result in poor levels of electoral equality. However, it has been possible to maintain the community ties between East Keal, West Keal and Keal Cotes.</p>
<b>Ingoldmells Rural</b>	1	-5%	This division includes 18 whole parishes including Anderby, Well, Partney, Orby & Ingoldmells. It is bounded by the sea to the east.	We received four division patterns for this area, one as a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. One further submission was also received which objected to a change in the geography or community of the division.



				<p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and preserved the existing extent of the division thus reflecting the existing community identities. A second scheme supported this proposal, and it is on these that the proposed division is based.</p> <p>Whole parishes have been incorporated into the division, and it retains a significant level of coterminosity with the existing ward boundaries. The division name remains the same.</p>
<b>Louth North</b>	1	-8%	<p>This division comprises 11 complete parishes including Fulstow, Yarburgh, Keddington and Fotherby. Also the northern extent of Louth parish.</p>	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. One further limited division pattern proposal was also received which related to Louth North and Louth South; however, it was not supported by electorate data.</p> <p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. Whole parishes have been used to build the division, which also retains a good level of coterminosity with the existing ward boundaries. We are of the view that such a division better reflects community identity in the area.</p> <p>The division name remains the same.</p>
<b>Louth South</b>	1	-5%	<p>This division comprises the parishes of Stewton. Legbourne, Little Cawthorpe and the southern extent of Louth.</p>	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. One further limited division pattern proposal was also received relating to Louth North and</p>

				<p>Louth South; however, it was not supported by electorate data.</p> <p>The division proposed is similar in each of the proposals with alterations to the south-eastern boundary. One of the schemes in particular provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. We are of the view that the use of whole parishes to build up the division helps to reflect community identity.</p> <p>We consider that the division has good internal road links which would assist in providing for efficient and effective local governance.</p>
<b>Louth Wolds</b>	1	5%	This division comprises 41 whole parishes including Holton le Clay, Binbrook, Asterby, Harrington and Raithby cum Maltby.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors.</p> <p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. A further submission provided support for this proposal and evidence of the community ties between North Thoresby, Grainsby and Waithe.</p> <p>Whole parishes have been used to build the division. We are of the opinion that the good internal road links across the division helps provide for convenient and effective local government. The name remains the same.</p>
<b>Mablethorpe</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises seven whole parishes and is bounded by the sea to the	We received four division patterns for this area, one as a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-

			east. It includes Belleau, Withern with Stain, Maltby le Marsh and the northern extent of Mablethorpe & Sutton.	<p>allocation of councillors. One further limited division pattern proposal was also received that was not supported by electorate data.</p> <p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district and it is on this that the proposed division is based. We are of the view that the use of whole parishes to build up the division helps to reflect community identity, and reflects existing well-defined boundaries.</p>
<b>Saltfleet &amp; the Cotes</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises 17 whole parishes and is bounded by the sea to the east, and the county boundary to the north. It includes the parishes of Grainthorpe, South Somercotes and Gayton le Marsh.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. No other submissions were received.</p> <p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. We are of the view that the use of whole parishes to build up the division helps reflect the community identity, and reflects existing well-defined boundaries.</p> <p>The division has been renamed to better reflect the geography and communities covered by it.</p>
<b>Skegness North</b>	1	0%	This division is bounded by the sea to the west, and extends to Skegness Water Leisure Park to the north, Skegness Academy to the south and Southview Leisure Park to the east.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. No other submissions were received.</p>

				<p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. There is a good level of coterminosity between the ward boundaries and electoral divisions. We have made a minor alteration to the southern boundary of the division in order to provide for a better level of electoral equality.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that the good internal road links across the division helps provide for convenient and effective local government. The name remains the same.</p>
<b>Skegness South</b>	1	-5%	This division is bounded by the sea to the east and includes Burgh le Marsh, Croft and the southern extent of Skegness parish.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. There were four further representations made in relation to Skegness South.</p> <p>Two of the four schemes proposed an identical division and it is on these that the division is based. This division pattern is supported by a number of local residents who highlight the community ties between Croft and Gibraltar Point and Skegness South. During a tour of the area it was observed that there were clear, well-established links between these areas.</p> <p>A number of objections were also received to this proposed division; however, adjusting the boundary to remove the parish of Burgh le Marsh has an adverse effect on the levels of electoral equality across the district.</p>
<b>Tattershall Castle</b>	1	1%	This division comprises 11 whole parishes and is bounded by the district	We received four division patterns for this part of East Lindsey and no further submissions. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors.

			boundary to the south and east. It includes Tumbly, Wildmore and Sibsey parishes, as well as the southern extents of Mareham le Fen and Revesby parishes.	Three of the four patterns proposed the same division boundary; this has been included as part of the draft recommendations. The electoral equality is good, and parish boundaries have been used to reflect existing community identities. The good internal road links across the division help provide for convenient and effective local government. The name remains the same.
<b>Wainfleet</b>	1	8%	This division comprises 18 whole parishes. It is bounded by the sea to the east and the district boundary to the south. It includes the parishes of Stickford, Spilsby and Firsby.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. There were seven further representations made in relation to Wainfleet.</p> <p>Two of the four schemes proposed very similar divisions and it is on these that the division is based. One submission provided evidence that the parishes of Bratoft, Irby in the Marsh, Firsby, Little Steeping and Great Steeping be included in the same division to achieve more convenient and effective local governance. A second submission commented on established community ties between Friskney and Wainfleet. Two submissions indicated that the parish of Croft would be more appropriately placed with Skegness South than Wainfleet based around community use and orientation.</p> <p>Two submissions objected to the parishes of Wainfleet and Burgh le Marsh not being included in the same division. During our tour of the area we observed that although the villages were reasonably close in proximity they were not connected by strong road links and remained distinct in their characteristics.</p>

				<p>One respondent proposed that the Keals, Kikrby, Stickney and Stickford should be grouped within the same division. Our investigations indicated that including all these parishes in the same division would result in poor levels of electoral equality. However, it has been possible to maintain the community ties between Stickney and Stickford.</p> <p>We are of the opinion that this division provides for good electoral equality. The inclusion of complete parishes maintains community ties were practicable. The good road network across the division helps promote convenient and effective local government. The division has been renamed Wainfleet to reflect the change in its geography.</p>
<b>Woodhall Spa &amp; Wragby</b>	1	4%	This division comprises 29 whole parishes and is bounded by the district to the west. It includes South Willingham, Woodhall Spa and Hemingby parishes.	<p>We received four division patterns for this area, one as part of a county-wide scheme the other three as district-wide schemes. One of the district schemes provided for an over-allocation of councillors. No other submissions were received.</p> <p>One of the schemes provided for excellent electoral equality across the district, and it is on this that the proposed division is based. We are of the view that the use of whole parishes to build up the division helps reflect community identity, and reflects existing well-defined boundaries. The good road links across the division helps to promote convenient and effective local government. The name remains the same.</p>



## Lincoln

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2121	Description	Detail
<b>Birchwood</b>	1	-3%	This division is bounded by the district boundary to the west and the Fen Plantation to the north. The eastern boundary includes Foal Close and Birchwood.	We received two division patterns for this division. Both were in agreement as to the shape of this division. Another representation was received objecting to the extension of the south-eastern boundary to include the Shearwater Road and Meadow Lake area. However, there is an adverse effect on the electoral equality in not including this area in the division. The division makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground.
<b>Boultham</b>	1	-2%	This division extends east from Swanpool to include Boultham and South Common.	We received two division patterns for this division. This division is based on one of them. Evidence was received as to the cohesiveness of the division, covered by a strong network of arterial roads. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. A minor alteration has been made in the south-east corner of the division to provide for coterminosity with the ward boundary and keep the Bracebridge area of the community together.
<b>Carholme</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the area south and west of Long Leys Road, Carholme Common and the area between the castle and Alderman's Walk.	We received two division patterns for this part of Lincoln. Our proposed division is based on one of them. It was also supported by a city councillor. Evidence was given as to the cohesiveness of the division, with suggestions that local residents are bonded through their use of Carholme Common as a recreational space and access route into the city. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Lincoln West to Carholme to better reflect the area contained within.

<b>Ermine &amp; Cathedral</b>	1	9%	This division comprises the area east of the Ermine Playing fields and west of Our Lady of Lincoln Playing fields.	We received two suggested division patterns for this area. This division is based on one of them. Evidence was received as to the cohesiveness of the division, particularly that the two Ermine housing areas which straddle the Riseholme Road should be included in the same division. The Christ's Hospital School has been included as it is used by local children and reflects the evidence received. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Lincoln North to Ermine & Cathedral to better reflect the area contained within.
<b>Hartsholme</b>	1	8%	This division includes Swanholme Lakes and Boultham Moor.	We received two division patterns for this part of Lincoln. This division is based on one of them, where the northern boundary was considered to be more easily identifiable. Another representation was received objecting to the removal the Shearwater Road and Meadow Lake areas along the north-western boundary. However, there is an adverse effect on the electoral equality in not doing so. The division makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. In light of a submission received the division has been named Hartsholme rather than Tritton to reflect its City of Lincoln ward name.
<b>Park</b>	1	3%	This division comprises New Boultham to the east and the area north and south of the Spires & Steeples trail, extending from the city centre to the district boundary.	We received two similar proposals for division arrangements for this area. This division is based on these proposals with minor alterations to follow more clearly identifiable boundaries. Evidence was received as to the similarity in housing stock and characteristics of the residents in this area. The division also allows for good electoral equality.
<b>St Giles</b>	1	0%	This division includes the St Giles area of Lincoln to the	We received two proposed patterns for this division, both were similar with the exception of a minor variation to the

			north and Greetwell Hollow nature reserve to the south.	western corner of the division. Evidence was given as to the unifying rather than divisive nature of Wragby Road. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground.
<b>Swallow Beck &amp; Witham</b>	1	1%	This division includes Swallow Beck, the properties either side of the River Witham along Hykeham Road and Brant Road.	We received two patterns for this part of Lincoln. This is based on one of them. Evidence was received as to the cohesiveness of the division. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Lincoln Bracebridge to Swallow Beck & Witham to better reflect the area contained within, and to reduce confusion between divisions as Bracebridge itself lies in the Hartsholme division.

#### North Kesteven

<b>Division Names</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Bassingham &amp; Welbourn</b>	1	4%	This division comprises Haddington, Bassingham, Beckingham, Leadenham and Navenby.	We received two proposals for division arrangements and a further representation from a member of the public. The division varies from those proposals received to allow for better electoral equality across the district; however, it does retain the links between Bassingham and Navenby. It makes use of parish boundaries, and achieves a good level of electoral equality.
<b>Eagle</b>	1	-1%	This division includes Skellingthorpe, North Searle Swinderby and Thorpe on the Hill.	We received two proposals for division arrangements and no further representations relating specifically to this part of the district. The proposed division is different from those put forward in either of the schemes to allow for better electoral equality across the district. It makes use of parish boundaries and achieves a good level of electoral

				equality. The division has been renamed Eagle rather than Skellingthorpe & Hykeham to better reflect its extent.
<b>Heckington</b>	1	6%	This division includes Swaton, Heckington, Ewerby, Billingham and North Kyme.	We received two proposals for division arrangements and four further representations specifically relating to this area. The division varies from those received to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We have not included Metheringham in this division as doing so would have resulted in a poor level of electoral equality. The proposed division makes use of parish boundaries and achieves a good level of electoral equality.
<b>Hykeham Forum</b>	1	-8%	This division extends south from the district boundary between Roman Road to the west and Lincoln Road to the east.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those put forward in order to allow for better electoral equality across the district. It makes use of clear division boundaries and achieves a good level of electoral equality.
<b>Potterhanworth &amp; Coleby</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises six whole parishes including Branston & Mere, Dunston and Harmston, and most of the Heighington parish area. It is bordered by the district boundary to the east.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those received to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We received two further submissions relating specifically to this area. The parishes of Dunston, Nocton and Potterhanworth are kept together to maintain existing community ties. Metheringham could not be included within the division as a result of the adverse effect on electoral variance. The parish of Branston & Mere has been included in a rural rather than town division. Parish boundaries have been used to create the division. The division has been renamed Potterhanworth & Coleby to better reflect the communities covered by it.
<b>Rowston</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises 11 whole parishes, and most of the Cranwell, Brauncewell &	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those suggested to allow for better electoral equality

			Byard's Leap parish. It also includes Metheringham, Dorrington and Scopwick parishes. It is bordered by the district boundary to the east.	across the district. We received one further submission relating specifically to this area. Metheringham could not be included in a division with Potterhanworth or Billingham whilst retaining a good level of electoral equality. However, the division reflects that Metheringham services many of the smaller parishes across the east of North Kesteven. The division has been renamed Rowston.
<b>Ruskington</b>	1	4%	This division comprises five whole parishes including Ruskington and North and South Rauceby. It also includes the south-eastern edge of Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard's Leap parish and the north-eastern area of Sleaford parish.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those suggested to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We received no further submissions relating specifically to this area. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed Ruskington.
<b>Sleaford</b>	1	-10%	This division comprises Sleaford, Clay Hill, Sleaford West Junction and Sleaford North Junction.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those put forward in order to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We received one further submission relating specifically to this area. This proposed no change to the area. However, no changes to the existing pattern of divisions in this area would not provide for good electoral equality. The proposed division allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground.
<b>Sleaford Rural</b>	1	-3%	This division comprises 10 whole parishes including Newton & Haceby, Screddington, Wilsford and the southern extent of Sleaford. It is bounded by the district	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those suggested to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We received no further submissions relating specifically to this area.

			boundary to the south and west.	
<b>Waddington</b>	1	1%	This division is bounded by Lincoln Road to the west, and extends east to Waddington and Waddington Heath.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. The proposed pattern varies from those put forward in order to allow for better electoral equality across the district. We received no further submissions relating specifically to this area. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. The division has been renamed from Bracebridge Heath & Waddington to Waddington to better reflect the area covered by it.
<b>Washingborough</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the parishes of Bracebridge Heath, Canwick, Washingborough and the north-east corner of Heighington.	We received two proposals for division arrangements relating to this area. One of the patterns received did not allow for internal access across the division. We received no further submissions relating specifically to this area. The proposed pattern also varies from those suggested to allow for better electoral equality across the district. The division has been renamed from Heighington & Washingborough to Washingborough to better reflect these changes.

### South Holland

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Cowbit</b>	1	-5%	This division comprises the parish of Cowbit and the southern extents of Weston and Moulton.	We received one division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this part of South Holland. The division proposed varies from that submitted to allow for better electoral variance and effective local governance. Parish boundaries have been used where possible in developing the proposed boundary to reflect existing community

				identities. The name has been changed to better reflect the area.
<b>Crowland</b>	1	-1%	This division includes the parish of Crowland and Deeping St Nicholas. It extends north to include Pinchbeck and Spalding commons.	We received a single division pattern proposal and one other submission for this division. The respondent objected to the inclusion of Deeping St Nicholas with Crowland. However, to separate the two areas has an adverse effect on the electoral equality. Whilst we will always seek, where possible, to reflect a community's identity during the creation of boundaries, we are not against the joining of two distinct communities to achieve a better electoral balance. The division proposed allows for good electoral equality, and we consider provides for effective and convenient local government. The name remains the same.
<b>Donington Rural</b>	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Donington, Quadring, Gosberton and Surfleet. It extends south to include part of Pinchbeck.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division is based on the proposal received with a minor alteration to the southern boundary to improve the electoral equality. Parish boundaries have been used where possible in developing the proposed boundary to reflect existing community identities. The name remains the same.
<b>Holbeach</b>	1	-4%	This division comprises Holbeach, north to Holbeach Marsh and west to Whaplode village.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division proposed varies from that submitted to allow for better electoral equality across the district whilst providing for effective and convenient local government. The name remains the same.
<b>Holbeach Rural</b>	1	5%	This division includes the parishes of Gedney, Luton, Fleet, Sutton St James and St Edmond and the southern	We received a single division pattern proposal and one further submission for this division. The division is based on the proposal received with an extension of the southern boundary to improve the electoral equality. The additional submission requested that the geography of the

			extents of Whaplode and Holbeach parishes.	division remain the same and whilst this has not been entirely possible, it remains similar to the existing pattern. Parish boundaries have been used where appropriate in developing the proposed boundary to reflect existing community identities. The name remains the same.
<b>Moulton Seas End</b>	1	-3%	This division extends north-east from the centre of Spalding to the coast, taking in Weston and Moulton Seas End.	We received a single division pattern proposal and one further submission for this division. The division proposed varies from that submitted to allow for better overall electoral equality whilst retaining effective local governance. The additional submission provided evidence that the houses along Halmer Gate were of a similar style and community type, also that the existing division boundary separated St Mary & St Nicholas Church from its parsonage. The proposed boundary brings these areas together within a single division. The name of the division has been changed to better reflect the geography of the division.
<b>Spalding Central</b>	1	-5%	This division is bounded by Spalding parish boundary to the west and the railway line to the east. The southern extend follows the A151 to Monks House where it heads north to meet the Pennygate diversion.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division is based on the proposal received with a minor alteration to the southern boundary to improve the electoral equality. The name of the division has been changed to better reflect the geography of the division.
<b>Spalding Elloe</b>	1	-2%	This division comprises both the Pinchbeck North and South Fens and extends east to Wardentree Lane.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division proposed varies from that submitted to allow for better overall electoral equality. The name remains the same.
<b>The Suttons</b>	1	10%	This division comprises the parishes of Long Sutton, Little Sutton, Sutton Bridge and Tydd St Mary.	We received a single division pattern proposal and three further submissions for this division. The division is based on the proposal received with a minor alteration to include the parish of Tydd St Mary to improve the electoral



				balance in the area. Further submissions made did not comment on the geography or community of the division, but supported the reduction in the number of councillors. Parish boundaries have been used where possible in developing the proposed boundary to reflect existing community identities. The name remains the same.
--	--	--	--	---

## South Kesteven

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
<b>Ancaster &amp; Manthorpe</b>	1	0%	This division comprises Ancaster, Honington, Barkston, Syston and Belton & Manthorpe.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The pattern is based on that received with a minor alteration to the southern boundary in Grantham to provide for better electoral equality across the district. The division has been renamed Ancaster & Manthorpe to better reflect the areas within.
<b>Barrowby</b>	1	-1%	This division includes the parishes of Allington, Sedgebrook, Woolsthorpe by Belvoir, Barrowby and the Earlsfield area of Grantham.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division is based on the proposal received. It provides for good electoral equality.
<b>Baston &amp; Barholm</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises eight whole parishes including Baston, Uffington, West Deeping and also the western extent on Market Deeping.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further submissions for this division. The division varies along the south-eastern boundary from that proposed to allow for good electoral equality across the district.
<b>Belton Park</b>	1	-10%	This division comprises Belton Park, to the north Londonthorpe and Alma Woods, and the barracks in the south.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further representations for this division. This division is based on that pattern. It allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the

				ground. It has been renamed Belton Park rather than Grantham East to better reflect the areas within.
<b>Bourne Croft &amp; Twenty</b>	1	3%	This division extends east from the castle, including the Austerby & Croft areas of Bourne out to the district boundary beyond the village of Twenty.	We received a single division pattern proposal and one further representation for this division, which did not include any information regarding the nature of the division. This division varies from that proposed to allow for better electoral equality across the district. It follows the Bourne parish boundary to the south, and divides Bourne along West Street and North Road. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. It has been renamed Bourne Croft & Twenty rather than Bourne South & Thurlby to better reflect the areas within.
<b>Bourne Woodview &amp; Morton</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises the north-west of Bourne parish, and Morton & Hanthorpe parish, extending east to the district boundary.	We received a single division pattern proposal and one further representation for this division which did not include any information regarding the nature of the division. This division varies from that proposed to allow for better electoral equality across the district. It follows the Morton & Hanthorpe parish boundary to north, and divides Bourne parish along West Street and North Road. The division also allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable boundaries on the ground. It has been renamed Bourne Woodview & Morton rather than Bourne North & Morton to better reflect the areas within.
<b>Colsterworth Rural</b>	1	8%	This division comprises 23 whole parishes including Denton, Great Ponton, Little Bytham, South Witham and Thurlby.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further representations relating directly to this division. The eastern and southern extent of the division have been amended to allow for better electoral equality across the district. The name has remained the same.
<b>Deeping St James</b>	1	-1%	This division comprises the parish of Deeping St James	We received a single division pattern proposal and a submission relating to the Deepings area of the division.

			and part of Market Deeping parish.	The respondent commented on the boundary arrangement for West Deeping, Market Deeping and Deeping St James but did not provide a pattern of divisions or supporting evidence. The current division boundaries provide for very poor electoral equality so could not be maintained.
<b>Green Hill</b>	1	4%	This division comprises the Green Hill area of Grantham, and is bounded to the north by the railway line and to the south by Dysart Road.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further representations relating directly to this division. The arrangement is based closely on that received with a minor alteration to the south-eastern boundary to allow for better electoral equality. The division has been renamed Green Hill rather than Grantham West to better reflect the area within.
<b>Hough</b>	1	-8%	This division comprises 14 whole parishes includes Claypole, Long Bennington, Great Gonerby, Hough-on-the-Hill and Fulbeck.	We received a single division pattern proposal for Hough, and the division is based on the pattern provided. We also received a single submission relating to the parliamentary constituency boundaries in this area. We do not undertake reviews of parliamentary constituency boundaries. The division allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries.
<b>Spittlegate</b>	1	3%	This division comprises the Spittlegate area of Grantham, and runs north to Wyndham Park, and east to Hall's Hill.	We received a single division pattern proposal and no further representations relating directly to this division. The arrangement is based closely on that received with a minor alteration to the western boundary to allow for better electoral equality. The division has been renamed Spittlegate rather than Grantham South to better reflect the area within.
<b>Stamford East</b>	1	2%	This division extends west from Little Casterton Road, Casterton Road, Scotgate, and St Mary's Street. It is bounded	We received two division patterns for Stamford. One submission proposed that three councillors be allocated for the area rather than two; however, the reduction in council size has meant that the retention of three councillors was not feasible. This submission also

			to the east by the River Gwash.	provided for strong boundaries between the divisions, which have been incorporated into the division pattern. The division name has remained unchanged.
<b>Stamford West</b>	1	-9%	This division extends west from the county boundary and is bounded to the east by Little Casterton Road, Casterton Road, Scotgate, and St Mary's Street.	We received two division patterns for Stamford. One submission proposed that three councillors be allocated for the area rather than two; however, the reduction in council size has meant that the retention of three councillors was not feasible. This submission also provided for strong boundaries between the divisions, which has been incorporated into the division pattern. The division name has remained unchanged.
<b>Upper Glens</b>	1	-6%	This division comprises 23 whole parishes including Heydour, Ingoldsby, Edenham, Dowsby and Horbling.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and the northern and eastern extents of our proposed division follow the same boundaries. Alterations have been made to the south and the western boundaries to provide for better electoral equality across the district. A further submission was received from a member of the public suggesting that Upper Glens would be a more appropriate name for the area than Folkingham Rural. This has been included as part of our draft recommendation.

### West Lindsey

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of Cllrs</b>	<b>Variance 2021</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Detail</b>
<b>Ancholme Cliff</b>	1	-7%	This division comprises 27 whole parishes and is bounded by the county boundary to the north and east. It includes Glentworth, Ingham,	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and no further submissions. The division proposed varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. This division allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable

			Willingham and north-east part of Welton parish.	parish boundaries on the ground. The division name has remained the same.
<b>Bardney &amp; Cherry Willingham</b>	1	7%	This division comprises 18 whole parishes and is bounded by the district boundary to the south. It includes the parishes of Lissington, Apley, Bardney, Fiskerton and Barlings.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and no further submissions. The division proposed varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. This division allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. The division name has remained the same.
<b>Gainsborough Hill</b>	1	8%	This division is bounded by the railway line to the west, Thonock parish to the north and Ancholme Cliff parish to the east.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and no further submissions. The division proposed is identical to that of the existing division. The division name has remained the same.
<b>Gainsborough Trent</b>	1	2%	This division is bounded by the county boundary to the west, extends east to the Pickering Pond, and follows the railway line north to Thonock Hill.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and no further submissions. The division proposed is identical to that of the existing division. The division name has remained the same.
<b>Market Rasen Wolds</b>	1	0%	This division comprises 22 whole parishes including Thoresway, North Willingham, Friesthorpe, Toft Newton and Normanby le Wold.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and three further submissions. The division proposed varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. This division allows for the villages of Middle and Market Rasen to be brought together as well as achieving good electoral equality and making use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. Binbrook parish cannot be brought into this division as it lies outside of the district boundary. Similarly Thorganby, Swinhope and Brookenby parishes cannot be moved outside of the district.
<b>Nettleham</b>	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Dunholme,	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and two further submissions. The division proposed

			Scothern, Sudbrooke, Nettleham and the south-west of Welton.	varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. Evidence received indicates that Nettleham and Saxilby do not share community ties, and this proposal allows for the areas to be separated. This division results in good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. The division name has been changed to reflect its new geography.
<b>North Wolds</b>	1	2%	This division comprises 17 whole parishes and is bounded by the county boundary to the north, east and west. Includes Keelby, North Kelsey, Owersby and Rothwell parishes.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and no further submissions. The division proposed varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. The division allows for good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. The division name remains the same.
<b>Saxilby</b>	1	3%	This division comprises 15 whole parishes including Scampton, Kettlethorpe and Torksey. It is bounded to the south and west by the district and county boundaries, respectively.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and one further submission. The division proposed varies from that submitted as result of the over-allocation of councillors to the district. Evidence received indicated that Nettleham and Saxilby do not share community ties, and this proposal allows for the areas to be separated. This division results in good electoral equality and makes use of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. The division name has been changed to reflect its new geography.
<b>Scotter Rural</b>	1	2%	This division comprises 20 whole parishes and is bounded by the county boundary to the north, east and west. It includes the parishes of Scotter, Morton, Pilham and Bishop Norton.	We received a single division pattern proposal for this area and one further submission. The division proposed varies from that submitted, extending to the east rather than south. Evidence received objected to any increase in division size; however, the overall change in electorate for the county prevents this from being a viable option. This division results in good electoral equality and makes use

				of clearly identifiable parish boundaries on the ground. The division name has not been changed.
--	--	--	--	---

## Conclusions

32 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	70	70
Number of electoral divisions	70	70
Average number of electors per councillor	7,978	8,292
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

### **Draft recommendation**

Lincolnshire County Council should comprise 70 councillors serving 70 single-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

### **Mapping**

**Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Lincolnshire. You can also view our draft recommendations for Lincolnshire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## Parish electoral arrangements

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

34 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, the district councils in Lincolnshire County have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.



35 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements as described below within the districts of Boston, East Lindsey, North Kesteven, South Holland and South Kesteven.

**Boston**

36 As result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Fishtoft parish.

**Draft recommendation**  
Fishtoft Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Willoughby Hills (returning four members), Hawthorn Tree (returning six members) and Fishtoft (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

37 As result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Kirton parish.

**Draft recommendation**  
Kirton Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Kirton Meeres (returning six members) and The Cots (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**East Lindsey**

38 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Mareham le Fen parish.

**Draft recommendation**  
Mareham le Fen Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Mareham Gate (returning one member) and Mareham Moor (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

39 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Revesby parish.

**Draft recommendation**  
Revesby Parish Council should comprise six councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Miningsby (returning four members) and Moorhouses (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

40 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Skegness parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Skegness Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Woodlands (returning eight members), Winthorpe (returning five members), Clock Tower (returning one member) and St Clement’s (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**North Kesteven**

41 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard’s Leap parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Cranwell, Brauncewell & Byard’s Leap Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Cranwell (returning five members) and Brauncewell (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

42 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Heighington parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Heighington Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Heighington Millfield (returning five members) and Bracken Hill (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

43 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for North Hykeham parish.

**Draft recommendation**

North Hykeham Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Memorial (returning three members), Jaguar (returning one member), Forum (returning two members), Moor (returning three members), Witham (returning three members), Grange (returning four members) and Meadow (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

44 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Sleaford parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Sleaford Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Castle (returning two members), Holdingham (returning two members), Moor (returning one member), Navigation (returning three members), Quarrington (returning eight members) and Westholme (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for South Hykeham parish.

**Draft recommendation**

South Hykeham Parish Council should comprise seven councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Crow (returning four members), Danker (returning two members) and Beacon (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**South Holland**

46 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Holbeach parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Holbeach Parish Council should comprise 18 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Sot's Hole (returning three members), Hurn (returning one member), Town (returning 13 members) and St John's (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

47 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Moulton parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Moulton Parish Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Moulton Seas End (returning nine members) and Moulton Chapel (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

48 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Pinchbeck parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Pinchbeck Parish Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Crossgate (returning five members), Common (returning one member) and Northgate (returning nine members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

49 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Weston parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Weston Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Weston Marsh (returning five members) and Weston Hills (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

50 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Whaplode parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Whaplode Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Saracen’s Head (returning one member), Village (returning six members) and Drove (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**South Kesteven**

51 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Bourne parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Bourne Town Council should comprise 15 councillors, as at present, representing four wards: North Fen (returning four members), South Fen (returning five members), Dyke Fen (returning one member) and Cawthorpe (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

52 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Market Deeping parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Market Deeping Town Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Mill Field (returning seven members) and Swine’s Meadow (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

53 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Stamford parish.

**Draft recommendation**

Stamford Town Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: All Saints North (returning three members), All Saints South (returning three members), St George's (returning four members), St John's (returning five members), St Mary's (returning four members) and St Peter's (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

**West Lindsey**

54 As a result of our proposed division boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Welton parish.

**Draft recommendation** Welton Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Well (returning four members) and Ryland (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 Have your say

55 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

56 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Lincolnshire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

57 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at [\*\*consultation.lgbce.org.uk\*\*](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

58 Submissions can also be made by emailing [\*\*reviews@lgbce.org.uk\*\*](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk) or by writing to:

**Review Officer (Lincolnshire)  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Millbank Tower  
London  
SW1P 4QP**

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Lincolnshire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

59 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices in Millbank (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

60 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

61 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

62 After the publication of our final recommendations, 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 draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Lincolnshire Council in 2017.

## Equalities

63 This report has been screened for impact on equalities, with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
<b>Boston</b>								
1	Boston North	1	8,123	8,123	2%	8,591	8,591	4%
2	Boston South	1	7,502	7,502	-6%	8,393	8,393	1%
3	Butterwick & Wrangle	1	8,360	8,360	5%	8,609	8,609	4%
4	Holland Fen & Sutterton	1	8,475	8,475	6%	8,582	8,582	3%
5	Skirbeck	1	8,426	8,426	6%	8,643	8,643	4%
6	Wyberton & Marshes	1	7,752	7,752	-3%	8,200	8,200	-1%
<b>East Lindsey</b>								
7	Alford & Sutton	1	7,880	7,880	-1%	8,305	8,305	0%
8	Horncastle & the Keals	1	7,974	7,974	0%	8,153	8,153	-2%
9	Ingoldmells Rural	1	7,622	7,622	-4%	7,894	7,894	-5%
10	Louth North	1	7,535	7,535	-6%	7,644	7,644	-8%



**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
11	Louth South	1	7,952	7,952	0%	7,918	7,918	-5%
12	Louth Wolds	1	8,664	8,664	9%	8,703	8,703	5%
13	Mablethorpe	1	7,494	7,494	-6%	7,874	7,874	-5%
14	Saltfleet & the Cotes	1	7,592	7,592	-5%	7,935	7,935	-4%
15	Skegness North	1	7,699	7,699	-3%	8,329	8,329	0%
16	Skegness South	1	7,852	7,852	-2%	7,917	7,917	-5%
17	Tattershall Castle	1	8,240	8,240	3%	8,389	8,389	1%
18	Wainfleet	1	8,876	8,876	11%	8,938	8,938	8%
19	Woodhall Spa & Wragby	1	8,447	8,447	6%	8,599	8,599	4%
<b>Lincoln</b>								
20	Birchwood	1	8,010	8,010	0%	8,072	8,072	-3%
21	Boultham	1	7,641	7,641	-4%	8,159	8,159	-2%
22	Carholme	1	8,060	8,060	-1%	8,220	8,220	-1%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

	<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
23	Ermine & Cathedral	1	8,978	8,978	13%	9,043	9,043	9%
24	Hartsholme	1	8,743	8,743	10%	8,951	8,951	8%
25	Park	1	8,383	8,383	5%	8,578	8,578	3%
26	St Giles	1	7,878	7,878	-1%	8,262	8,262	0%
27	Swallow Beck & Witham	1	8,295	8,295	4%	8,370	8,370	1%
<b>North Kesteven</b>								
28	Bassingham & Welbourn	1	8,447	8,447	6%	8,595	8,595	4%
29	Eagle	1	7,578	7,578	-5%	8,189	8,189	-1%
30	Heckington	1	8,796	8,796	10%	8,813	8,813	6%
31	Hykeham Forum	1	6,839	6,839	-14%	7,608	7,608	-8%
32	Potterhanworth & Coleby	1	7,744	7,744	-3%	7,806	7,806	-6%
33	Rowston	1	7,865	7,865	-1%	7,942	7,942	-4%
34	Ruskington	1	8,527	8,527	7%	8,584	8,584	4%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
35 Sleaford	1	7,212	7,212	-10%	7,482	7,482	-10%
36 Sleaford Rural	1	7,213	7,213	-10%	8,052	8,052	-3%
37 Waddington	1	7,657	7,657	-4%	8,340	8,340	1%
38 Washingborough	1	8,216	8,216	3%	8,661	8,661	4%
<b>South Holland</b>							
39 Cowbit	1	7,545	7,545	-5%	7,861	7,861	-5%
40 Crowland	1	7,605	7,605	-5%	8,212	8,212	-1%
41 Donington Rural	1	8,415	8,415	5%	8,745	8,745	5%
42 Holbeach	1	7,794	7,794	-2%	7,946	7,946	-4%
43 Holbeach Rural	1	8,594	8,594	8%	8,719	8,719	5%
44 Moulton Seas End	1	7,723	7,723	-3%	8,075	8,075	-3%
45 Spalding Central	1	6,843	6,843	-14%	7,850	7,850	-5%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
46 Spalding Elloe	1	7,483	7,483	-6%	8,162	8,162	-2%
47 The Suttons	1	8,936	8,936	12%	9,108	9,108	10%
<b>South Kesteven</b>							
48 Ancaster & Manthorpe	1	8,269	8,269	4%	8,282	8,282	0%
49 Barrowby	1	8,061	8,061	1%	8,220	8,220	-1%
50 Baston & Barholme	1	7,465	7,465	-6%	7,634	7,634	-8%
51 Belton Park	1	7,486	7,486	-6%	7,491	7,491	-10%
52 Bourne Croft & Twenty	1	7,938	7,938	-1%	8,556	8,556	3%
53 Bourne Woodview & Morton	1	6,531	6,531	-18%	7,696	7,696	-7%
54 Colsterworth Rural	1	8,871	8,871	11%	8,927	8,927	8%
55 Deeping St James	1	8,165	8,165	2%	8,237	8,237	-1%
56 Green Hill	1	6,134	6,134	-23%	8,625	8,625	4%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
57 Hough	1	7,750	7,750	-3%	7,646	7,646	-8%
58 Spittlegate	1	8,034	8,034	1%	8,536	8,536	3%
59 Stamford East	1	8,570	8,570	7%	8,480	8,480	2%
60 Stamford West	1	7,616	7,616	-5%	7,557	7,557	-9%
61 Upper Glens	1	7,824	7,824	-2%	7,827	7,827	-6%
<b>West Lindsey</b>							
62 Ancholme Cliff	1	7,682	7,682	-4%	7,678	7,678	-7%
63 Bardney & Cherry Willingham	1	8,501	8,501	7%	8,914	8,914	7%
64 Gainsborough Hill	1	8,499	8,499	7%	8,966	8,966	8%
65 Gainsborough Trent	1	7,928	7,928	-1%	8,460	8,460	2%
66 Market Rasen Wolds	1	8,257	8,257	3%	8,273	8,273	0%
67 Nettleham	1	8,525	8,525	7%	8,915	8,915	8%
68 North Wolds	1	7,925	7,925	-1%	8,493	8,493	2%

**Table A1: (cont) Draft recommendations for Lincolnshire County Council**

<b>Division name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2015)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2021)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
69 Saxilby	1	8,389	8,389	5%	8,553	8,553	3%
70 Scotter Rural	1	8,554	8,554	7%	8,459	8,459	2%
<b>Totals</b>	70	558,455	–	–	580,447	–	–
<b>Averages</b>	–	–	7,978	–	–	8,292	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lincolnshire County Council.

Note: The ‘variance from average’ column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral division 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 B

## Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/lincolnshire/lincolnshire-county-council>

### Local authorities

- Lincolnshire County Council Administration Group
- West Lindsey District Council
- South Holland District Council

### Councillors

- Cllr T. Speakman (Lincoln City – Carholme Ward)
- Cllr M. Allan (Lincolnshire County – Sleaford Division)
- Cllr R. Hills (Lincoln City – Hartsholme Ward)
- Cllr M. Overton (Lincolnshire County – Branston & Navenby Division)
- Cllr C. Pain (Lincolnshire County – Wainfleet & Burgh Division)
- Cllr D. McNally (Lincolnshire County – Louth Marsh Division)
- Cllr V. Ayling (Lincolnshire County – Spilsby Fen Division)
- Cllr J. Charters (North Hykeham Town Council)

### Political parties

- Lincolnshire Labour Group
- Louth & Horncastle Conservative Association

### Parish & town councils

- Alford Town Council
- Bourne Town Council
- Bracebridge Heath Parish Council
- Branston & Mere Parish Council
- Claypole Parish Council
- Croft Parish Council
- Firsby Group Parish Council
- Fotherby Parish Council
- Friskney Parish Council
- Glentham Parish Council
- Great Limber Parish Council
- Heckington Parish Council
- Helpringham Parish Council
- Holland Fen with Brothertoft Parish Council
- Honington Parish Meeting
- Huttoft Parish Council
- Ingoldmells Parish Council

- Long Sutton Parish Council
- Market Deeping Town Council
- Market Rasen Town Council
- Metherringham, Sot's Hole & Tanvats Parish Council
- Middle Rasen Parish Council
- Moulton Parish Council
- Nettleham Parish Council
- North Thoresby, Grainsby & Waithe Parish Council
- Saltfleetby Parish Council
- Scothern Parish Council
- Scotter Parish Council
- Stamford Town Council
- Sutton Bridge Parish Council
- Sutton St James Parish Council
- Tydd St Mary Parish Council
- Wainfleet St Mary Parish Council

**Members of the public**

- 18 Members of the public



# Appendix C

## Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on 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 fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	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
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
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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