APPENDIX A

## RESPONSES TO BOUNDARY COMMITTEE DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

| District | Authority/Body/Person | Comments | Officer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| All | Mr. M. T. Jones CC | Mr. Jones opposes the creation of Two Member Divisions as they create divisions of up to 20, 000 electors which are too large for one councillor.<br><br>It creates confusion amongst electorate and breaks links between electing the best candidate rather than electing the party political representatives | The County Council did not consider the possible establishment of two member electoral divisions in developing its proposals and has not, as yet, taken any view on the principle. |
| All | Mr. N. J. Brown CC | Mr. Brown objects to the creation of Two Member Divisions on the following main points.<br><br>Each division would have average of 18, 000 electorate<br><br>Both Members would have equal status which may cause confusion on consultation issues especially if both councillors are from different political parties<br><br>Two Member Divisions will confuse the electorate and places greater distance between the elected member and electorate.<br><br>Candidates may not stand for two Member Divisions because before and after the elections the workload will be twice as much as a single member division. | As above. |

| District | Authority/Body/Person | Comments | Officer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Blaby | Dr. D. Pollard CC | Dr. Pollard supports the Boundary Committee's draft recommendations but requests that the proposed Blaby Division name be changed to Blaby and Glen Parva to reflect equal status of both parishes in the Division | The draft recommendations amend the County Council's proposals in the south-east of the District. |
| Blaby | Mr. E. F. White CC | Mr. White asked the Constitution Committee to note that the proposed Stanton, Croft and Normanton Electoral Division is too large and diverse making it difficult to represent. | |
| Blaby | Blaby District Council | The District Council at its meeting on 23rd March 2004 agreed to continue to support the proposals contained in the County Council's scheme. | |
| Charnwood | Mrs. C. E. Brock CC | Mrs Brock supports the draft recommendations | |
| Charnwood | Mr. D. J. Knaggs, CC | Mr. Knaggs opposes the establishment of a two member division for Birstall and Thurmaston because the two areas have little in common. He supports proposals for that area contained in the County Council's scheme. | |

| District | Authority/Body/Person | Comments | Officer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Charnwood | Mr. R.M. Wilson, CC | Mr. Wilson opposes the Boundary Committee's draft recommendations for a two member electoral division covering Birstall and Thurmaston. He has put forward an alternative proposal which he hopes the County Council will support involving the following divisions<br><br>2007 Electorate — % Variation on 9166 average<br><br>Division 14<br>Birstall Wanlip 4321<br>Birstall Watermead 5331<br>9652 +5.4%<br><br>Division 13<br>Thurmaston 7073<br>Queniborough Ward (part) 556 + 5<br>Barkby Parish<br>Barkby Thorpe Parish<br>Beeby Parish<br>South Croxton----------<br>Parish 7634 -16.71%<br><br>Division 12<br>Syston East 4817<br>Queniborough Ward (part) 1879 + 18<br>Queniborough Parish<br>Wreake Villages 851<br>7565 -17.4% | Mr. Wilson put this proposal to the Boundary Committee at an earlier stage of the Review. The Boundary Committee's report (para 92) indicates that it does not consider the proposal would reflect community identities. |

| District | Authority/Body/Person | Comments | Officer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Harborough | Dr. R. K. A. Feltham CC | Dr. Feltham supports the draft recommendation in that there should be 55 County Councillors with 7 of representing Harborough District.<br><br>Dr. Feltham provided further community evidence to support the Boundary Committees proposal to adopt the proposed Gartree Electoral Division such as circulation of a free community newspaper and the creation of a pressure group called East Leicestershire Villages Against Airspace. | The draft recommendations are consistent with the County Council's proposals. |
| Hinckley and Bosworth | Mrs. V. P. Bill CC | Mrs. Bill objects the proposal for two member divisions due to size and lack of understanding of the local community.<br><br>Mrs. Bill suggested another alternative of adjusting Burbage and having four divisions for Hinckley<br><br>Mrs. Bill supports the County Council proposal. However, if a two member division is recommended she would like the name to be Hinckley South and Burbage or vice versa. | This would result in splitting a district ward via its parish wards and reduce coterminosity further. Good electoral equality could not be achieved. |

| District | Authority/Body/Person | Comments | Officer Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hinckley and Bosworth | Mr. I.D. Ould, CC | Mr. Ould has written expressing concerns about the size of the proposed Market Bosworth Electoral Division and suggesting that it would be a mistake to include Barlestone in that Division. | Moving Barlestone from the proposed Market Bosworth Electoral Division to the proposed Ratby, Desford and Thornton Electoral Division would improve electoral equality and meet the concerns of the parish councils in the area. However, it would reduce coterminosity with District Wards. |
| Hinckley and Bosworth | Carlton Parish Council | Carlton Parish Council wrote direct to the Boundary Committee asking for Barlestone to be moved to Mallory as Barlestone has a greater affinity with Newbold Verdon. | The County Council's proposals were consistent with these views. |
| Hinckley and Bosworth | Barlestone Parish Council | The Parish council wrote direct to the Boundary Committee expressing its concern about being placed with Market Bosworth Electoral Division. The Parish Council indicated that Market Bosworth Electoral Division is a large rural area and they are on the edge of the division. The Parish Council indicated that the amount of time their local Councillor would be available to the residents of the parish would be greatly reduced | The County Council's proposals were consistent with these views. |
| North West Leicestershire District Council | Mr. N. J. Rushton CC | Mr. Rushton supports the proposal for North West Leicestershire suggested by the Boundary Committee in their draft recommendations | The Boundary Committee's recommendations improve upon the County Council's proposals in terms of electoral equality. |