

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Kent County Council

Electoral review

May 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

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	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	4
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Detailed divisions	6
Ashford Borough	8
Canterbury City	10
Dartford Borough	14
Dover District	16
Gravesham Borough	18
Maidstone Borough	20
Sevenoaks District	22
Shepway District	25
Swale Borough	28
Thanet District	31
Tonbridge & Malling Borough	33
Tonbridge Wells Borough	35
Conclusions	37
Parish electoral arrangements	37
3 Have your say	40

Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Kent County Council	42
B Submissions received	50
C Glossary and abbreviations	52

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 Kent?

We are conducting an electoral review of Kent 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 Kent. Overall, 31% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%; Romney Marsh has a variance of +38%.

Our proposals for Kent

Kent County Council currently has 84 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that a decrease in council size by three members will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that Kent County Council's 81 councillors should represent 65 single-member divisions and eight two-member divisions. None of our proposed 73 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Kent by 2020.

You have until 6 July 2015 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 40 for how to have your say.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Kent County 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 legislation¹ 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

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council 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 our consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
18 November 2014	Council size decision
9 December 2014	Division pattern consultation
12 May 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
7 July 2015	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
29 September 2015	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.

¹ 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)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ 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.

	2014	2020
Electorate of Kent County	1,092,651	1,157,343
Number of councillors	81	81
Average number of electors per councillor	13,490	14,288

10 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2020. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Kent.

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 Kent County 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

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

³ 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 2020, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2015. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 5.9% to 2020. The highest proportion of this growth across the county is expected in the borough of Dartford. Dover is also projected to see substantial growth over the next five years.

15 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are 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

16 Kent County Council submitted a proposal to retain the council size of 84. We carefully considered the representation received. We considered that the Council's submission proposing a council of 84 members was not supported by adequate evidence to justify a council size out of range when compared with its nearest statistical neighbour authorities. We considered that a council size of 81 members was appropriate based on the evidence received and that the authority can operate efficiently and effectively and ensure effective representation of local residents under this council size. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 81.

17 We received two submissions concerning council size in response to the consultation on division patterns. One did not support a reduction in size and the other supported splitting the council into two councils of 42 members each. We received no other comments. We were not persuaded by the evidence received to change our decision and we have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 81 elected members.

18 A council size of 81 provides the following allocation between the district councils in the county:

- Ashford District – seven councillors
- Canterbury City – eight councillors, a reduction of one
- Dartford Borough – six councillors
- Dover District – seven councillors
- Gravesham Borough – five councillors
- Maidstone Borough – nine councillors
- Sevenoaks District – six councillors, a reduction of one
- Shepway District – six councillors
- Swale Borough – seven councillors
- Thanet District – seven councillors, a reduction of one
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough – seven councillors
- Tunbridge Wells Borough – six councillors

Division patterns

19 During consultation on division patterns, we received 59 submissions, including a county-wide proposal from Kent County Council. We also received a scheme from the Labour Group on Kent County Council for Dover, Gravesham, Shepway, Swale and Thanet, the areas where they disagreed with the Council's scheme. We received a scheme from Canterbury & Coastal Liberal Democrats for Canterbury and from the UKIP Group for Swale. We received a scheme for Sevenoaks from a local resident and a scheme for Dartford from a local resident. The scheme in Dartford matched that of the Council scheme. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in particular districts.

20 Having carefully considered the proposals received, we were of the view that the proposed patterns of divisions in the Council's proposals resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the county and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries. We have based our proposals for Ashford, Canterbury, Dartford, Maidstone, Sevenoaks, Shepway, Tonbridge & Malling and Tunbridge Wells on these proposals. However, we have made modifications in some areas to minimise electoral variances and ensure more identifiable boundaries.

21 In Dover, Swale and Thanet we have based our recommendations on the Labour Group proposals with some modifications to ensure our recommendations provide a good reflection of our statutory criteria. We also based some of our proposals for Swale on the submission from UKIP. In Gravesham, we were unable to base our recommendations on any of the submitted schemes as they all would result in either poor electoral equality or would not follow clearly identifiable boundaries. Therefore, in Gravesham we have put forward our own division arrangements.

22 Our draft recommendations are for 65 single-member divisions and eight two-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.

23 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 42–9) and on the large map accompanying this report. 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.

Detailed divisions

24 The tables on pages 8–36 detail our draft recommendations for each district in Kent. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Ashford District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Ashford Central	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Bybrook, Barrow Hill and Godinton Park.	This division is identical to the existing division as we consider it continues to provide good electoral equality for the area while reflecting community identities.
Ashford East	1	0%	This division includes the unparished areas of Willesborough and South Willesborough, and part of Sevington parish.	These divisions are almost identical to the existing divisions and we note they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area. We have made a small modification to the boundary between the two divisions to use the River Stour as the northern boundary of Ashford East division. This affects seven electors who are moved from Ashford East to Ashford Rural East division.
Ashford Rural East	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Aldington, Bonnington, Brook, Chilham, Crundale, Godmersham, Hastingleigh, Mersham, Molash, Smeeth and Wye with Hinxhill and part of Sevington parish. It also includes the unparished area of Kennington.	
Ashford Rural South	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Bilsington, Kingsnorth, Orlestone, Ruckinge, Shadoxhurst, Warehorne and Woodchurch.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a small modification to include the entire parish of Stanhope in Ashford South division. We consider this better reflects the community in this area.

Ashford Rural West	1	-5%	This division includes the parishes of Bethersden, Boughton Aluph, Challock, Charing, Eastwell, Egerton, High Halden, Hothfield, Little Chart, Pluckley and Westwell. It also includes part of the parish of Great Chart with Singleton, and a small part of the unparished area of Goat Lees.	This division is based a proposal received during consultation. However, we propose to move Smarden parish to Tenterden division to allow us to ensure electoral equality in that division.
Ashford South	1	5%	This division includes the unparished area of South Ashford and Ashford town centre as well as the parish of Stanhope and part of the parish of Great Chart with Singleton.	This is based on a proposal received during consultation with a small modification to include the entire parish of Stanhope in this division. We are satisfied that it provides a good reflection of our statutory criteria.
Tenterden	1	-5%	This division includes the parishes of Appledore, Biddenden, Kenardington, Newenden, Rolvenden, Smarden, Stone-cum-Ebony, Tenterden and Wittersham.	We propose to move Smarden parish from Ashford Rural West division to ensure good electoral equality in this division. We received a submission from Biddenden Parish Council that supported Biddenden remaining in Tenterden division. We are persuaded that this will reflect community identities and have retained the parish in this division.

Canterbury City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Canterbury City North	1	7%	This division is made up of the unparished areas of Canterbury that make up the City Council wards of Northgate and St Stephen's and parts of Westgate and Blean Forest wards.	The reduction of three councillors across Kent means that the number of councillors for Canterbury is reduced from nine to eight. This means that there will be significant change to electoral divisions in Canterbury. We propose a division that covers areas in the north of the city which we consider share a common identity and interests.
Canterbury City South	1	3%	This division is made up of the unparished areas of Canterbury that make up the City Council ward of Barton and parts of the Westgate and Wincheap wards.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation, with a minor modification to provide a more identifiable boundary. The county-wide submission excluded a part of Martyrs' Field from the division which, whilst partly coterminous with a City Council ward, appeared not to follow identifiable ground detail. Instead we choose to include a small area of housing on the Canterbury city side of the A2 as detailed below. This provides good electoral equality for both Canterbury City divisions.
Canterbury North	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Chestfield, Hackington, Harbledown & Rough Common and St Cosmus & St Damian in the Blean. It also includes parts of the parish of Chartham and the	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The reduction in the number of councillors in Canterbury means that the rural division will be larger than the existing division. This proposed

			<p>unparished area around the University of Kent at Canterbury, and South Street near Whitstable.</p>	<p>division covers parishes to the north and west of Canterbury city, which we consider have a similar character and shared community identities and interests. This division also unites all of the campus of the University of Kent in one division. We consider that this division provides good electoral equality.</p>
Canterbury South	1	-7%	<p>This division includes the parishes of Adisham, Barham, Bekesbourne-with-Patrixbourne, Bishopsbourne, Bridge, Fordwich, Ickham & Well, Kingston, Littlebourne, Lower Hardres, Petham, Thanington Without, Upper Hardres, Waltham, Wickhambreaux, and Womenswold. It also includes part of the parish of Chartham and a small unparished area of South Canterbury.</p>	<p>This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a small modification. We propose to include the parish of Fordwich in this division. We also propose that the parish of Westbere and village of Hersden in Sturry parish be included in our proposed Herne Village & Sturry division. We noted that the parish of Westbere and village of Hersden have no transport links to their south with the main railway line out of Canterbury separating them from parishes to the south.</p> <p>This division includes all of the rural parishes to the south and west of Canterbury city that have many shared interests and community ties. The proposed division also provides good electoral equality for the area. This proposal is supported by Bekesbourne-with-Patrixbourne and Littlebourne parish councils.</p>

Herne Bay East	1	2%	This division is made up of the majority of eastern and central Herne Bay and Beltinge.	Herne Bay has too large an electorate for a single-member division. We therefore propose that this division includes the centre of Herne Bay and surrounding area which we consider best reflects the community identities in this part of Canterbury district.
Herne Village & Sturry	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Chislet, Herne & Broomfield, Hoath, Westbere and Sturry. It also includes the unparished areas of Hillborough, Bishopstone and Reculver.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with the modifications mentioned above, and a change of name. We propose a division that includes the parishes in the north and east of Canterbury which we consider are of a similar character and identity. This division provides for good electoral equality. We propose to name this division Herne Village & Sturry. Our proposed division is in line with a submission from Herne & Broomfield Parish Council.
Whitstable East & Herne Bay West	1	1%	This division includes the unparished areas of Tankerton, Swalecliffe and Greenhill.	We propose that part of Whitstable and part of Herne Bay be included in a division due to the fact that Whitstable and Herne Bay each have an electorate that is too large for single-member divisions covering these areas. Given these constraints, we consider our proposed division reflects community identities and interests in this area and uses clearly identifiable boundaries.

Whitstable West	1	6%	This division includes the unparished areas of central Whitstable and Seasalter.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. Like Herne Bay, Whitstable contains too many electors for a single-member division. We propose that the centre of Whitstable and Seasalter form a division that, based on the evidence received, continues to reflect community identity. We propose to name this division Whitstable West.
------------------------	---	----	--	--

Dartford Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Dartford East	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Hesketh and the Fleet Estate as well as parts of the parishes of Stone and Darenth.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. It includes the area of Castle from Stone parish which is currently included in the Swanscombe & Greenhithe division. This improves the electoral equality in both divisions.
Dartford North East	1	3%	This division includes the unparished areas of Temple Hill and New Town, and the Milestone area of Stone parish.	These divisions are identical to the existing divisions and we believe they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area while reflecting community identities.
Dartford Rural	1	-4%	This division includes the parishes of Bean, Longfield & New Barn, Southfleet and Sutton-at-Hone & Hawley. It also includes part of the parish of Darenth.	
Dartford West	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Dartford Town Centre and Bowmans.	
Swanscombe & Greenhithe	1	7%	This division includes the parish of Swanscombe & Greenhithe.	
				This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The area of Castle in Stone parish is transferred to the proposed Dartford East division. This improves the electoral equality in both divisions. This division is scheduled to include the first development of the Ebbsfleet Garden City site and its

				<p>electorate is projected to grow by 52% by 2020. Two submissions suggested that the division required an extra councillor or that the review should be halted due to the proposed development of Ebbsfleet Garden City.</p> <p>We asked the Council to provide us with projected electorates and we are satisfied that the projected figures of 52% growth are the best available at the present time. These figures therefore have formed the basis of our draft recommendations.</p>
Wilmington	1	-3%	This division includes the parish of Wilmington as well as the unparished areas of Brooklands, Maypole and Joydens Wood.	This division is identical to the existing division and we believe it continues to offer good reflection of our statutory criteria.

Dover District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Deal Town	2	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Deal, Sholden and Walmer.	We propose adding the parish of Sholden to the existing Deal Town division as we consider that this is where community ties lie in this area. We were not persuaded by the proposal to place this area into two single-member divisions as proposed by the county-wide submission. We consider this proposal would result in a division of a cohesive community and that a single two-member division provides the best balance between our statutory criteria. Sholden Parish Council supported its inclusion in the proposed division.
Dover North	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Aylesham, Great Mongeham, Guston, Langdon, Nonington, Northbourne, Ringwould with Kingsdown, Ripple, St Margaret's at Cliffe, Sutton and Tilmanstone.	This division is identical to the existing division and we believe it continues to offer good electoral equality for the area.
Dover Town	2	-7%	This division includes the parishes of Dover and River.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. We have made a slight modification to both divisions. The proposed division of Dover Town had a variance of -11%. We consider this variance to be too high and we propose to include the parish of River in our Dover Town
Dover West	1	-9%	This division includes the parishes of Alkham, Capel-le-Ferne, Denton with Wootton, Eythorne, Hougham Without,	

			Lydden, Shepherdswell with Coldred, Temple Ewell and Whitfield.	division. We consider this is appropriate given the transport and community links in the area. Furthermore, this improves the electoral equality for both divisions.
Sandwich	1	2%	This division includes the parishes of Ash, Eastry, Goodnestone, Preston, Sandwich, Staple, Stourmouth, Wingham, Woodnesborough and Worth.	This division is identical to the existing division and we consider it continues to offer good electoral equality for the area while reflecting community identities.

Gravesham Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Gravesend Central	2	6%	This division includes the central and southern part of Gravesend.	We were not persuaded that the proposals submitted for Gravesham sufficiently met our three statutory criteria of equality of representation, reflecting community interests and identities and providing for convenient and effective local government. We have therefore developed our own proposals for this area. We propose a two-member division for central Gravesend that we consider reflects the communities in the area and minimises electoral variances.
Gravesend North	1	6%	This division includes the north and eastern part of Gravesend, the parish of Higham and part of the parish of Shorne.	We propose a division which includes the north and east parts of Gravesend and the villages to the east of the town. We consider that this is reflective of communities in the area, as these villages have good communication and transport links to Gravesend. To ensure good electoral equality for this division and the division of Gravesham Rural it is necessary to divide the parish of Shorne between these divisions. We therefore propose to include those properties north of the A226 Gravesend Road in this division. This improves the electoral equality in both this and the adjoining Gravesham Rural division.

Gravesham Rural	1	8%	This division includes the parishes of Cobham, Luddesdown, Meopham and Vigo, part of the parish of Shorne and the unparished areas of Istead Rise and a small part of Gravesend.	We propose a division that includes all of the parishes to the south of the A2 and part of the parish of Shorne that lies to the north of the A2. None of the submissions we received for this division provided good electoral equality, nor did they propose sufficiently identifiable boundaries for the area. We consider that our proposed division provides the best balance of our three statutory criteria.
Northfleet	1	7%	This division includes the unparished areas of Northfleet and the western part of Gravesend.	We propose a division that contains all of Northfleet and a small part of west Gravesend which we consider reflects the communities in this area.

Maidstone Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Maidstone Central	2	-1%	This division includes the centre of Maidstone including the areas of Allington, Barming Heath, Cherry Orchard and Upper Fant.	These divisions are almost identical to the existing divisions and we believe they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area. We have made one small modification by moving an area of the town centre from Maidstone Central division to Maidstone North East. This proposal is based on the county-wide submission.
Maidstone North East	1	-2%	This division includes the unparished areas of Boxley Road, Penenden Heath, Ringlestone and Vinters Park. It also includes a small part of the parish of Boxley.	
Maidstone Rural East	1	1%	This division includes the parishes of Bicknor, Boughton Malherbe, Broomfield & Kingswood, Detling, East Sutton, Frinsted, Harrietsham, Headcorn, Hollingbourne, Hucking, Lenham, Otterden, Stockbury, Thurnham, Ulcombe, Wichling and Wormshill.	These divisions are identical to the existing divisions and we believe they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area while reflecting community identities.
Maidstone Rural North	1	6%	This division includes the parishes of Bearsted and Bredhurst, the vast majority of the parish of Boxley and a small unparished area of Maidstone.	
Maidstone Rural South	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Chart Sutton, Collier Street, Langley, Marden, Staplehurst and Sutton	

			Valence and part of the parish of Boughton Monchelsea.	to this division from Maidstone Rural West in exchange for the parishes of Loose. This ensures that electoral variances are kept to a minimum in both divisions.
Maidstone Rural West	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Barming, Coxheath, East Farleigh, Hunton, Linton, Loose, Nettlestead, Teston, West Farleigh and Yalding.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The parish of Loose is transferred to this division from Maidstone Rural South in exchange for the parishes of Collier Street and Marden. This improves the electoral equality in both divisions.
Maidstone South	1	3%	This division includes the unparished areas of North Loose and Shepway North and the parish of Tovil.	These divisions are identical to the existing divisions and we believe they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area.
Maidstone South East	1	-4%	This division includes the unparished areas of Shepway South and Parkwood, the parishes of Downswood, Leeds and Otham and part of the parish of Boughton Monchelsea.	

Sevenoaks District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Darent Valley	1	3%	This division includes the parishes of Crockenhill, Dunton Green, Eynsford, Farningham, Halstead, Horton Kirby & South Darent, Knockholt, Otford and Shoreham.	<p>The reduction of three councillors across Kent means that the number of councillors for Sevenoaks is reduced from seven to six. This reduction was not supported by Edenbridge Town Council in a submission received. However, in order to ensure good electoral equality, it is necessary to provide this allocation of councillors to Sevenoaks.</p> <p>This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a slight amendment to include all of Swanley parish in a Swanley division. We consider that these parishes share good communication and transport links as well as reflecting community identity along the Darent Valley. This proposal was supported by Crockenhill Parish Council.</p>
Sevenoaks East	1	-1%	This division includes the parishes of Kemsing, Seal, Sevenoaks Weald and the eastern part of Sevenoaks parish.	We consider that the parishes to the east of Sevenoaks share good communication links with central Sevenoaks and each other. We also consider that the A25, main railway line and A225 provide a clearly identifiable boundary between east and west Sevenoaks.

Sevenoaks North East	1	-1%	This division includes the parishes of Ash-cum-Ridley, Fawkham, Hartley and West Kingsdown.	We consider that this division best represents the community ties in this area, with West Kingsdown having clear transport links with the parishes of Ash-cum-Ridley Fawkham and Hartley on the other side of the M20.
Sevenoaks Rural	1	7%	This division includes the parishes of Chiddingstone, Cowden, Edenbridge, Hever, Leigh, Penshurst and Westerham.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation and consists of the rural parishes to the south and west that make up the existing Sevenoaks Rural division. We propose adding the parish of Westerham to the existing division to provide for better electoral equality for the area.
Sevenoaks West	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Brasted, Chevening, Riverhead and Sundridge with Ide Hill and the western part of the parish of Sevenoaks.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. These parishes run north–south to the west of Sevenoaks and we consider that they form a coherent rural community in this part of Sevenoaks. As mentioned above we consider that the A25, main railway line and A225 provide a clearly identifiable boundary between east and west Sevenoaks.
Swanley	1	10%	This division includes the parishes of Hextable and Swanley.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a slight amendment to include all of Swanley parish in a Swanley division. We consider that although this division has a relatively high electoral variance it best reflects community

				identities in this area. This proposal is supported by Hextable Parish Council.
--	--	--	--	---

Shepway District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Cheriton, Sandgate & Hythe East	1	4%	This division includes the unparished area of Cheriton, the parishes of Saltwood and Sandgate and the eastern part of the parish of Hythe.	<p>This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The high levels of electoral inequality in Romney Marsh require that the existing division is divided between two new divisions. The geography of the area necessitates that the new Romney Marsh division must include part of Hythe. Hythe parish must therefore be divided between two divisions, with part of the parish included in a division with surrounding areas.</p> <p>We visited the area and we consider that the eastern part of Hythe parish should form a division with Sandgate, Saltwood and Cheriton in the unparished area of Folkestone. We consider that these areas share many characteristics, community ties and transport links. Hythe Town Council requested that Hythe division and parish boundaries be coterminous but as stated above we are unable to recommend this given the need to provide a balance between our three statutory criteria.</p>

Elham Valley	1	2%	This division includes the parishes of Acrise, Elham, Elmsted, Hawkinge, Lyminge, Monks Horton, Newington, Paddlesworth, Postling, Sellindge, Stanford, Stelling Minnis, Stowting and Swingfield.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The parishes of Lymgne and Saltwood are transferred to the divisions of Hythe West and Cheriton, Sandgate & Hythe East respectively. Upon visiting the area we saw evidence that Lymgne and Saltwood had community ties with the town of Hythe and the proposed division improves electoral equality in all three divisions.
Folkestone East	1	-6%	This division includes the unparished areas of East Folkestone around the Canterbury and Dover Roads and East Cliff.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. This division and the neighbouring division of Folkestone West reverse the current north–south split of Folkestone in favour of an east–west split. We consider that this division uses easily identifiable boundaries and provides for good electoral equality for the area.
Folkestone West	1	-3%	This division includes the unparished areas of West Folkestone and Morehall.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. This division and the neighbouring division of Folkestone East reverse the current north–south split of Folkestone in favour of an east–west split. We consider that this division uses easily identifiable boundaries and provides for good electoral equality for the area.

Hythe West	1	1%	This division includes the western part of Hythe parish and the parishes of Burmarsh, Dymchurch, Lympne, Newchurch and part of the parish of St Mary in the Marsh.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The western part of Hythe parish is paired with Dymchurch and other parishes to the west with which it has good transport links and community ties.
Romney Marsh	1	2%	This division includes the parishes of Brenzett, Brookland, Ivychurch, Lydd, New Romney, Old Romney and Snargate and part of the parish of St Mary in the Marsh.	<p>This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The current Romney Marsh division has a variance of 38%. This is an unacceptably high variance and to reduce this it is necessary to move the parishes of Burmarsh, Dymchurch, Newchurch and part of St Mary in the Marsh to the Hythe West division. One submission received suggested that the projected electorate figures for Hythe and Romney Marsh were too low.</p> <p>We accept that electoral forecasting is an inexact science but having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time.</p>

Swale Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Mid Swale	1	1%	This division includes the parishes Bapchild, Bredgar, Luddenham, Lynsted with Kingsdown, Milstead, Norton, Buckland & Stone, Oare, Rodmersham, Teynham and Tonge. It also includes parts of the parishes of Faversham and Tunstall.	<p>This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a major modification to provide for more identifiable boundaries. It should be noted that the Commission is not normally minded to recommend a 'doughnut' division – that is one that is entirely surrounded by another division. We are not persuaded that it reflects community identities or will ensure effective and convenient local government for those electors in the surrounding division. It is therefore necessary to divide the town of Faversham between divisions.</p> <p>Our proposed Mid Swale division includes the Swale Borough Council wards of Priory and St Ann's and part of Watling ward, along with the rural parishes between Faversham and Sittingbourne either side of the A2. We consider this is reflective of the communities in the area and provides good electoral equality. Faversham Town Council and Teynham Parish Council do not support a proposal that divides Faversham between divisions but as mentioned above we are not persuaded we have received sufficient evidence to accommodate this proposal.</p>

Sheppey	2	6%	This division includes the parishes of Eastchurch, Leysdown, Minster-on-Sea, Queenborough and Warden and the unparished area of Sheerness.	We propose a division that is an amalgamation of the existing two single-member divisions of Sheerness and Sheppey East. Our two-member division has a variance of 6% which improves electoral equality for the Isle of Sheppey.
Sittingbourne North	1	1%	This division includes the unparished area of Sittingbourne to the north of the A2.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. Having visited the area, we propose to include the area of Murston in a division with other areas of north Sittingbourne as we considered that to keep those in separate divisions would not represent effective and convenient local government or reflect community ties. We also recognise that, with the opening of Swale Way since the last review of Kent, Murston has good communication and transport links with the rest of North Sittingbourne.
Sittingbourne South	1	-2%	This division includes all of Sittingbourne south of the A2 and a part of the parish of Tunstall.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. We have included part of the parish of Tunstall in our Sittingbourne South division to ensure that our division uses the same boundary as the borough ward, which we consider is clearly identifiable.
Swale East	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Badlesmere, Boughton under Blean, Dunkirk, Doddington, Eastling,	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation with a major modification to Faversham as mentioned

			Graveney with Goodnestone, Hernhill, Leaveland, Newnham, Ospringe, Selling, Sheldwich and Stalisfield and part of the parish of Faversham.	above. We propose that the borough ward of Abbey and part of Watling ward are included in a division with the parishes to the south and east of Faversham. We consider this is reflective of the communities in the area and provides good electoral equality.
Swale West	1	9%	This division includes the parishes of Bobbing, Borden, Hartlip, Iwade, Lower Halstow, Newington and Upchurch and the unparished areas of Grove Park and The Meads.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. We propose that the parishes to the west of Sittingbourne are included in a division with the unparished areas of The Meads and Grove Park on the outskirts of Sittingbourne. We consider this is reflective of the communities in the area and provides for good electoral equality. This proposal was supported by Iwade Parish Council.

Thanet District

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Birchington & Rural	2	3%	This division includes the parish of Acol, Birchington, Cliffsend, Manston, Minster, Monkton, Sarre and St Nicholas at Wade. It also includes the unparished areas of Garlinge, Westbrook and Westgate-on-Sea.	<p>We propose a two-member division that amalgamates the two divisions suggested during consultation. The reduction of three councillors across Kent means that the number of councillors for Thanet is reduced from eight to seven. As a result, the divisions in Thanet need to be substantially redrawn.</p> <p>Our proposed division includes the parish of Birchington and surrounding rural parishes with an unparished area to the west of Margate containing Garlinge, Westbrook and Westgate-on-Sea. We also include the parish of Cliffsend in this division. When visiting the area we noted that this area has good communication links throughout the proposed division.</p>
Broadstairs	1	4%	This division includes part of the parish of Broadstairs and St Peter's.	We propose a single-member division to replace the current two-member division of Broadstairs & Sir Moses Montefiore. Our proposed division does not include the East Cliff part of Ramsgate parish which is included in Ramsgate division. We have also included North Foreland in a division with Cliftonville which allows us to provide good electoral equality for the area.

Cliftonville	1	-4%	This division includes the unparished area of Cliftonville and part of the parish of Broadstairs and St Peter's.	Margate and Cliftonville currently make up a two-member division that has poor electoral equality with a variance of -20%. We propose two single-member divisions in this area, one for Margate and one for Cliftonville which we consider best reflects the community ties in the area and provides for much improved electoral equality.
Margate	1	0%	This division includes the unparished areas of Central and South Margate.	
Ramsgate	2	2%	This division includes the parish of Ramsgate.	

Tonbridge & Malling Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Malling Central	1	3%	This division includes the parishes of West Malling and East Malling & Larkfield and part of the parish of Ditton.	The current division splits the parish of East Malling & Larkfield as a result of a development that has occurred since the last review of Kent County Council. We propose to include part of the parish of Ditton in this division. The county-wide submission was circulated to parish councils prior to its submission to the Commission and West Malling and East Malling & Larkfield parish councils and the county councillor for Malling Central support the division of Ditton parish. Whilst this area had acceptable electoral equality our proposed change improves it.
Malling North	1	0%	This division includes the parishes of Addington, Birling, Leybourne, Offham, Ryarsh, Snodland and Trottiscliffe.	This division is almost identical to the existing division and we consider that it continues to provide good electoral equality for the area. We have made a small modification by moving the parish of Stansted to our proposed Malling West division. This provides for a more identifiable boundary in the area and also improves electoral equality.
Malling North East	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Aylesford, Burham, Wouldham and part of the parish of Ditton.	As mentioned above, we have transferred part of the parish of Ditton from this division

				to Malling Central to provide for better electoral equality in both divisions.
Malling Rural East	1	2%	This division includes East Peckham, Hadlow, Kings Hill, Mereworth, Wateringbury and West Peckham.	This division is identical to the existing division and we believe it continues to offer the best balance between our statutory criteria.
Malling West	1	-6%	This division includes the parishes of Borough Green, Hildenborough, Ightham, Platt, Plaxtol, Shipbourne, Stansted and Wrotham.	This division is almost identical to the existing division and we believe it continues to offer good electoral equality for the area. We made a small modification by moving the parish of Stansted to this proposed division. This provides for a more identifiable boundary in the area, improves electoral equality and ensures the proposed division continues to reflect community identities.
Tonbridge	2	-4%	This division includes the unparished area of Tonbridge.	This division is identical to the existing division and we believe it continues to provide good electoral equality for the area while reflecting local communities.

Tunbridge Wells Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2020	Description	Detail
Cranbrook	1	-3%	This division includes the parishes of Benenden, Cranbrook & Sissinghurst, Frittenden, Goudhurst, Hawkhurst and Sandhurst.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. The current electoral division of Cranbrook has poor electoral equality. To remedy this, we propose to transfer the parish of Goudhurst from the division of Tunbridge Wells Rural. Goudhurst has good transport links to the rest of the division and moving it into Cranbrook division provides good electoral equality for both divisions.
Tunbridge Wells East	1	-8%	This division includes the unparished area of Sherwood and the parish of Pembury.	These divisions are identical to the existing divisions and we believe they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area.
Tunbridge Wells North	1	-6%	This division includes the unparished area of St John's and the parish of Southborough.	
Tunbridge Wells Rural	1	-8%	This division includes the parishes of Brenchley, Capel, Horsmonden, Lamberhurst and Paddock Wood.	This division is based on a proposal received during consultation. We propose to transfer the parish of Goudhurst from this division to Cranbrook. Goudhurst has good transport links to the rest of the division and moving it into Cranbrook provides good electoral equality. Lamberhurst Parish Council supported a proposal where it remains in its existing division.

Tunbridge Wells South	1	2%	This division includes the unparished area of Tunbridge Wells South.	These divisions are identical to the existing divisions and we consider they continue to offer good electoral equality for the area while reflecting community identities. Tunbridge Wells Borough Council supported the current divisions being unchanged.
Tunbridge Wells West	1	-1%	This division includes the unparished area of Mount Ephraim and west Tunbridge Wells. It also includes the parishes of Bidborough, Rusthall and Speldhurst.	

Conclusions

25 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2014 and 2020 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2014	2020
Number of councillors	81	81
Number of electoral divisions	73	73
Average number of electors per councillor	13,490	14,288
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	0
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0

Draft recommendation

Kent County Council should comprise 81 councillors serving 65 single-member divisions and eight two-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 Kent.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Kent on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

26 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.

27 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 and borough councils in Kent 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.

28 As a result of our proposed ward 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 Chartham Parish in Canterbury City.

Draft recommendation

Chartham Parish Council should comprise 11 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chartham & Chartham Hatch (returning 7 members) and St Augustine’s (returning four members).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

29 As a result of our proposed ward 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 Shorne Parish in Gravesham Borough.

Draft recommendation

Shorne Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Shorne North (returning two members) and Shorne Village (returning seven members).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

30 As result of our proposed ward 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 Folkestone in Shepway District.

Draft recommendation

Folkestone Town Council should comprise 18 councillors, the same as at present, representing seven wards: Broadmead (returning two members), Central (returning four members), Cheriton East (returning one members), Cheriton West (returning three members), East Folkestone (returning four members), Harbour (returning three members) and Harvey West (returning one member).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

31 As result of our proposed ward 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 Faversham in Swale Borough.

Draft recommendation

Faversham Town Council should comprise 14 councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Abbey (returning four members), Davington Priory (returning two members), St Ann’s (returning four members), Watling Ospringe (returning two members) and Watling Preston (returning two members).
The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

32 As a result of our proposed ward 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 Ditton parish in Tonbridge & Malling Borough.

Draft recommendation

Ditton Parish Council should comprise 13 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Ditton North (returning four members) and Ditton South (returning nine members).

The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 Have your say

33 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.

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

35 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

Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Kent)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor, Millbank Tower
Millbank
London
SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Kent 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?

36 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 Tower (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

37 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.

38 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.

39 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 Kent County Council in 2017.

Equalities

40 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 Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Ashford District								
1	Ashford Central	1	12,341	12,341	-9%	13,993	13,993	-2%
2	Ashford East	1	12,938	12,938	-4%	14,272	14,272	0%
3	Ashford Rural East	1	12,625	12,625	-6%	13,488	13,488	-6%
4	Ashford Rural South	1	13,137	13,137	-3%	13,916	13,916	-3%
5	Ashford Rural West	1	13,820	13,820	2%	13,554	13,554	-5%
6	Ashford South	1	12,332	12,332	-9%	15,060	15,060	5%
7	Tenterden	1	13,354	13,354	-1%	13,630	13,630	-5%
Canterbury City								
8	Canterbury City North	1	14,524	14,524	8%	15,221	15,221	7%
9	Canterbury City South	1	14,032	14,032	4%	14,709	14,709	3%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
10	Canterbury North	1	14,696	14,696	9%	15,401	15,401	8%
11	Canterbury South	1	12,653	12,653	-6%	13,261	13,261	-7%
12	Herne Bay East	1	13,955	13,955	3%	14,624	14,624	2%
13	Herne Village & Sturry	1	14,743	14,743	9%	15,451	15,451	8%
14	Whitstable East & Herne Bay West	1	13,790	13,790	2%	14,450	14,450	1%
15	Whitstable West	1	14,413	14,413	7%	15,104	15,104	6%
Dartford Borough								
16	Dartford East	1	12,214	12,214	-9%	13,988	13,988	-2%
17	Dartford North East	1	11,679	11,679	-13%	14,660	14,660	3%
18	Dartford Rural	1	12,997	12,997	-4%	13,660	13,660	-4%
19	Dartford West	1	12,783	12,783	-5%	14,038	14,038	-2%
20	Swanscombe & Greenhithe	1	10,037	10,037	-26%	15,271	15,271	7%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
21	Wilmington	1	13,435	13,435	0%	13,851	13,851	-3%
Dover District								
22	Deal Town	2	24,106	12,053	-11%	26,302	13,151	-8%
23	Dover North	1	11,003	11,003	-18%	13,896	13,896	-3%
24	Dover Town	2	24,468	12,234	-9%	26,655	13,328	-7%
25	Dover West	1	12,193	12,193	-10%	13,060	13,060	-9%
26	Sandwich	1	12,944	12,944	-4%	14,527	14,527	2%
Gravesham Borough								
27	Gravesend Central	2	29,646	14,823	10%	30,281	15,141	6%
28	Gravesend North	1	14,505	14,505	8%	15,177	15,177	6%
29	Gravesham Rural	1	15,413	15,413	14%	15,469	15,469	8%
30	Northfleet	1	14,376	14,376	7%	15,358	15,358	7%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Maidstone Borough								
31	Maidstone Central	2	26,401	13,201	-2%	28,376	14,188	-1%
32	Maidstone North East	1	13,299	13,299	-1%	13,970	13,970	-2%
33	Maidstone Rural East	1	13,748	13,748	2%	14,494	14,494	1%
34	Maidstone Rural North	1	14,536	14,536	8%	15,201	15,201	6%
35	Maidstone Rural South	1	12,526	12,526	-7%	13,173	13,173	-8%
36	Maidstone Rural West	1	12,623	12,623	-6%	13,414	13,414	-6%
37	Maidstone South	1	13,699	13,699	2%	14,692	14,692	3%
38	Maidstone South East	1	12,144	12,144	-10%	13,777	13,777	-4%
Sevenoaks District								
39	Darent Valley	1	14,966	14,966	11%	14,740	14,740	3%
40	Sevenoaks East	1	14,322	14,322	6%	14,194	14,194	-1%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
41	Sevenoaks North East	1	14,628	14,628	8%	14,154	14,154	-1%
42	Sevenoaks Rural	1	15,591	15,591	16%	15,343	15,343	7%
43	Sevenoaks West	1	13,451	13,451	0%	13,804	13,804	-3%
44	Swanley	1	15,790	15,790	17%	15,787	15,787	10%
Shepway District								
45	Cheriton, Sandgate & Hythe East	1	14,252	14,252	6%	14,790	14,790	4%
46	Elham Valley	1	13,999	13,999	4%	14,527	14,527	2%
47	Folkestone East	1	12,962	12,962	-4%	13,453	13,453	-6%
48	Folkestone West	1	13,381	13,381	-1%	13,886	13,886	-3%
49	Hythe West	1	13,878	13,878	3%	14,402	14,402	1%
50	Romney Marsh	1	14,013	14,013	4%	14,545	14,545	2%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Swale Borough								
51	Mid Swale	1	13,895	13,895	3%	14,439	14,439	1%
52	Sheppey	2	29,216	14,608	8%	30,359	15,180	6%
53	Sittingbourne North	1	13,936	13,936	3%	14,483	14,483	1%
54	Sittingbourne South	1	13,496	13,496	0%	14,024	14,024	-2%
55	Swale East	1	12,892	12,892	-4%	13,401	13,401	-6%
56	Swale West	1	14,964	14,964	11%	15,551	15,551	9%
Thanet District								
57	Birchington & Rural	2	27,479	13,740	2%	29,363	14,682	3%
58	Broadstairs	1	14,170	14,170	5%	14,810	14,810	4%
59	Cliftonville	1	13,256	13,256	-2%	13,731	13,731	-4%
60	Margate	1	13,731	13,731	2%	14,328	14,328	0%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
61	Ramsgate	2	27,802	13,901	3%	29,240	14,620	2%
Tonbridge & Malling Borough								
62	Malling Central	1	13,594	13,594	0%	14,691	14,691	3%
63	Malling North	1	13,212	13,212	-2%	14,279	14,279	0%
64	Malling North East	1	12,763	12,763	-5%	13,793	13,793	-3%
65	Malling Rural East	1	13,541	13,541	0%	14,637	14,637	2%
66	Malling West	1	12,428	12,428	-8%	13,431	13,431	-6%
67	Tonbridge	2	25,459	12,730	-6%	27,516	13,758	-4%
Tunbridge Wells Borough								
68	Cranbrook	1	13,898	13,898	3%	13,830	13,830	-3%
69	Tunbridge Wells East	1	13,140	13,140	-3%	13,201	13,201	-8%
70	Tunbridge Wells North	1	13,703	13,703	2%	13,362	13,362	-6%
71	Tunbridge Wells Rural	1	13,059	13,059	-3%	13,147	13,147	-8%

Table A1: (cont.) Draft recommendations for Kent County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2014)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2020)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
72	Tunbridge Wells South	1	13,377	13,377	-1%	14,582	14,582	2%
73	Tunbridge Wells West	1	14,279	14,279	6%	14,096	14,096	-1%
Totals		81	1,092,651	-	-	1,157,343	-	-
Averages		-	-	13,490	-	-	14,288	-

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the district. 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

Local authority

- Kent County Council

Political groups

- Kent County Council Labour Group
- Kent County Council Liberal Democrat Group for Maidstone
- Kent County Council UKIP Group for Swale
- Canterbury & Coastal Liberal Democrats

District councils

- Sevenoaks District Council
- Tonbridge & Malling Borough Council
- Tunbridge Wells Borough Council

Councillors

- County Councillor T. Dean
- County Councillor M. Baldock
- County Councillor M. Whybrow
- County Councillor P. Stockell
- Dartford Borough Councillor D. Swinerd

Parish and town councils

- Herne & Broomfield Parish Council (two submissions)
- Ditton Parish Council
- Biddenden Parish Council
- Lamberhurst Parish Council
- Boughton Monchelsea Parish Council
- Edenbridge Town Council
- Iwade Parish Council
- Crockenhill Parish Council
- Faversham Town Council
- Teston Parish Council
- Bekesbourne-with-Patrixbourne Parish Council
- Hythe Town Council
- Ightham Parish Council
- Shoreham Parish Council
- Hextable Parish Council

- Wingham Parish Council
- Hildenborough Parish Council
- New Romney Town Council
- Burmarsh Parish Council
- Sholden Parish Council
- Marden Parish Council
- Littlebourne Parish Council
- Southfleet Parish Council
- Kemsing Parish Council
- Teynham Parish Council
- Rodmersham Parish Council & Milstead Parish Council (Joint Submission)
- Sandwich Town Council
- Swanscombe & Greenhithe Town Council
- Hawkinge Town Council
- Snodland Council
- West Malling Parish Council

Local organisations

- NHS Dartford, Gravesham and Swanley and NHS Swale Clinical Commissioning Groups
- Kennington Community Forum
- Kent Association of Local Councils

Residents

- 11 local residents

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 www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

