

APPENDIX B

Possible options for a new warding scheme

The following information is presented, not as an option for a warding scheme, but to highlight some of the difficulties that will be involved in arriving at a final conclusion and to pinpoint the clusters of parishes or parts of parishes that are likely to meet the statutory criteria.

It will be immediately apparent that reaching agreement on a suitable warding pattern will be considerably more challenging in the southern portion of the district than elsewhere.

The clusters listed below are presented as a first stab at a new ward scheme for further discussion. It is not yet possible to be any more definitive about possible linkages between particular groups of parishes and more work will be needed after member input.

The figures quoted are final as they reflect the actual and forecast figures now submitted to, and accepted by, the LGBCE.

Cluster of parishes/ polling districts	Cllrs	Elect. 2012	Quota % (1598)	Elect. 2018	Quota % (1774)	Comments
Ashdon, Hadstock, Sewards End and Little Walden	1	1552	-3	1689	-5	Existing ward plus Little Walden
Great and Little Sampford, Hempstead, Radwinter and Lt Bardfield	1	1738	+9	1885	+6	Existing ward plus Little Bardfield (although the variance from the electoral quota will be virtually identical if the ward remains unchanged). This would allow Lt Bardfield to go into either a Thaxted or a Stebbing based ward)
Debden and Wimbish	1	1730	+8	1883	+6	Existing ward
Saffron Walden less Little Walden	7	11754	+5	12438	+0	Three existing wards of three members each less Lt Walden; the division could then be into two, two member wards and one three member ward. Based on existing ward boundaries, Audley and Castle (x2 members) would need to lose roughly 300 electors each and Shire (x3

APPENDIX B

						members) to gain roughly 600 electors
Great & Little Chesterford and Littlebury Village	1	1783	+12	1952	+10	Existing ward plus Littlebury Village; this would mean that Littlebury parish must be warded. Hadstock would make a better fit than Littlebury in terms of figures alone but is considered unsuitable because of a lack of direct transport links between the two areas. If part of Littlebury is to be added to this ward it would be better to divide Littlebury parish along a different boundary to the existing polling district split as that will make a better fit with the average elector/member ratio.
Chrishall, Elmdon, Duddenhoe End, Wenden Lofts, Littlebury Green, Strethall and Wendens Ambo	1	1549	-3	1622	-9	Combining parts of the existing Littlebury and Wenden Lofts wards (but see above comments relating to the Chesterfords)
Arkesden, Clavering and Langley	1	1610	+1	1653	-7	Combining parts of the existing Clavering, Littlebury and Wendens Lofts wards
Newport, Quendon and Rickling, Wicken Bonhunt and Widdington	2	2942	-8	3431	-3	Existing ward plus Wicken Bonhunt
Berden, Farnham, Manuden and Ugley	1	1585	-1	1654	-7	Existing ward plus Ugley
Elsenham, Henham and Chickney	2	2869	-10	3630	+2	Existing ward
Birchanger and Stansted	4	6247	-2	6937	-2	Both existing Stansted wards less Ugley but including Birchanger (and all of Forest Hall Park)

APPENDIX B

<p>Broxted, Mole Hill Green, Takeley, Priors Green, Great and Little Canfield and High Roding</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	<p align="center">4583</p>	<p align="center">-4</p>	<p align="center">5398</p>	<p align="center">+1</p>	<p>Existing ward plus parts of The Eastons and The Rodings wards; this will entail either three, single member wards or one single and one, two member ward. Whichever arrangement is agreed Takeley parish will almost certainly need to be divided and therefore separate parish wards will be needed; ideally, Priors Green should all be included within the same ward and that might entail a rearrangement of polling venues in both Little Canfield and Takeley. Eventually, a further Community Governance Review may be needed to reorganise parishes.</p>
<p>Duton Hill, Great and Little Easton, Thaxted and Tilty</p>	<p align="center">2</p>	<p align="center">3408</p>	<p align="center">+7</p>	<p align="center">3594</p>	<p align="center">+1</p>	<p>Existing ward (Thaxted) less Little Bardfield and plus most of The Eastons ward</p>
<p>Great Dunmow and Barnston</p>	<p align="center">5</p>	<p align="center">7766</p>	<p align="center">-3</p>	<p align="center">9477</p>	<p align="center">+7</p>	<p>The allocation of wards to Great Dunmow presents a tricky problem because of the scale of projected electorate increase. Without the addition of another parish (either Barnston or Little Dunmow would be feasible), GD itself would be entitled to only four councillors in 2012, but five councillors by 2018. The addition of Barnston would resolve this difficulty but this creates further problems in allocating wards to the remainder of the district (see remaining entries</p>

APPENDIX B

						below)
Lindsell, Stebbing, Little Dunmow, Flitch Green, and Felsted (both East and West)	3	5308	+11	5573	+5	Existing wards of Felsted and Stebbing; The division of wards is unclear but one possible arrangement is to add Little Dunmow to the existing Stebbing ward electing one member and Felsted plus Flitch Green would then elect two members. This would still produce a variance and it will almost certainly be necessary to divide Felsted to produce balanced wards
Great and Little Hallingbury, Bush End, Hatfield Broad Oak, Hatfield Heath, High Easter, and Aythorpe, Leaden, Margaret and White Roding	4	5911	-8	6380	-10	Existing wards of Broad Oak and the Hallingburys, Hatfield Heath, most of The Rodings and part of Barnston and High Easter. The division between these parishes into four separate wards (or two, two member wards) would be difficult and they would be relatively under-represented. As an alternative to the above, Little Bardfield could be added to The Sampfords ward, Little Dunmow to Great Dunmow wards, and Barnston to the cluster of parishes in this section. If Barnston parish were added to this group the figures would improve (but see comments relating to Dunmow above). As for the Hallingburys the existing link with HBO will not work and the only options seems to be for Gt & Lt Hallingbury to be linked with Hatfield heath in a

APPENDIX B

						two member ward or for part of Lt Hallingbury to join with Hatfield Heath to produce the required balance.
	39	62,711	1598	69,196	1774	