

**From:** [reviews](#)  
**To:** [Hendry, Angela](#)  
**Subject:** FW: FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST  
**Date:** 20 June 2023 09:43:25

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 18, 2023 7:34 PM  
**To:** reviews <reviews@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUEST

Dear LGBCE,

I cannot find a dedicated freedom of information email address on your website, so I am sending this request to this 'reviews' address, Please redirect if this is the wrong address.

Your board minutes for November 2022 state

"The Board agreed to remove Tower Hamlets from the electoral review programme as they no longer trigger an intervention."

Could you provide under Freedom of Information provisions :

- a. Any documentation and/or information relating to this decision and the original decision to add Tower Hamlets to the electoral review programme
- b. Any documentation relating to the inclusion or exclusion of any other London Borough from the current programme, since the completion of the last round of reviews in London

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

---

[REDACTED]  
Email : [REDACTED]  
Phone : [REDACTED]  
Twitter : [REDACTED]

Home : [REDACTED]

Acton Office : [REDACTED]

Alternative email : [REDACTED]

**From:** [Hendry, Angela](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** FOI Response  
**Date:** 13 July 2023 17:01:00  
**Attachments:** [Email No 1.pdf](#)  
[Email No 2.pdf](#)  
[LGBCE \(22-23\)068-ReviewProgramme-intervention-2022-09-20.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Dear [REDACTED]

**FOI Ref: 87739/23**

Thank you for your request for information dated 19 June 2023, under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

You requested:

**Your board minutes for November 2022 state**

**“The Board agreed to remove Tower Hamlets from the electoral review programme as they no longer trigger an intervention.”**

**Could you provide under Freedom of Information provisions :**

- a. **Any documentation and/or information relating to this decision and the original decision to add Tower Hamlets to the electoral review programme**
- b. **Any documentation relating to the inclusion or exclusion of any other London Borough from the current programme, since the completion of the last round of reviews in London**

Please find attached three documents in response to your FOI request.

1. Email from the Commission’s GIS & Data officer explaining why Tower Hamlets no longer meets the Commission’s intervention criteria.
2. Email from the Commission’s Review & Programme Manager explaining that Tower Hamlets no longer meets the Commission’s intervention criteria and is not being considered for a review.
3. September 2022 Commission board paper that recommended Tower Hamlets should be included in the review programme.

The Commission is due to consider it’s review programme at its board meeting on 18 July. Relevant information that you have requested is included in that paper. The paper has not yet been considered by the Board. However, a copy of the paper and its minutes will be sent to you once the minutes to the meeting have been agreed. Please note that this does not include a recommendation to include Tower Hamlets.

If you wish to request a review of our decision, you should write to:

Kathryn Trower  
Director of Corporate Services  
Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Windsor House  
50 Victoria Street  
London  
SW1H 0TL

Kind regards

Angela Hendry

**Angela Hendry**  
**Office Manager and HR Lead**

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Windsor House  
50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to give us your views.

**From:** [Evison, Alison](#)  
**To:** [Hendry, Angela](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Tower Hamlets  
**Date:** 13 July 2023 11:06:18  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

**From:** Ram Avtaar <ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 25, 2022 3:29 PM  
**To:** Evison, Alison <alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk>  
**Subject:** Tower Hamlets

Hi Alison,

As discussed, Tower Hamlets seemed to be a strange case. – the following may help if commissioners' question the cause for this.

This is ultimately due to the initial raw data that was given to us I believe during the last round of data collection being somewhat off.

- Back in April 2022 (possibly earlier) the variance of the Tower Hamlets wards looks like:

% Variance	Years					
	District	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Tower Hamlets						
Bethnal Green	6.9%	6.0%	5.3%	0.6%		
Blackwall and Cubitt Town	-10.9%	-8.8%	-7.0%	-4.1%	3.0%	
Bow East	-0.9%	-1.4%	3.8%	3.9%	2.2%	
Bow West	7.0%	6.3%	6.3%	3.9%	59.2%	
Bromley North	-12.4%	-11.4%	-12.5%	-11.7%	1.6%	
Bromley South	-0.8%	1.8%	1.0%	1.2%	-12.0%	
Canary Wharf	8.6%	8.1%	8.2%	12.0%	1.4%	
Island Gardens	11.2%	11.0%	7.8%	9.0%	24.6%	
Lansbury	-5.2%	-3.6%	-2.0%	-0.9%	-27.1%	
Limehouse	9.7%	10.7%	8.0%	5.9%	196.8%	
Mile End	2.3%	2.3%	2.1%	2.5%	-65.4%	
Poplar	4.4%	7.4%	5.3%	8.6%	208.6%	
Shadwell	-1.4%	-0.8%	-4.1%	-3.9%	-45.6%	
Spitalfields and Banglatown	0.9%	-2.1%	-2.4%	-1.5%	-4.7%	
St Dunstan's			2.9%	3.3%	0.4%	
St Katharine's and Wapping			-0.5%	-1.7%	3.9%	
St. Dunstan'S	4.6%	4.6%				
St. Katharine'S and Wapping	0.0%	-0.7%				
St. Peter's	3.7%	3.3%	4.2%	2.5%		
Stepney Green	-3.8%	-4.5%	-7.0%	-7.6%	-7.4%	
Weavers	7.5%	5.1%	4.7%	3.7%	2.6%	
Whitechapel	-14.8%	-15.5%	-13.7%	-13.9%	-30.7%	
Bethnal Green East					1.4%	
Bethnal Green West					-34.5%	

The figures represented above seemed very inconsistent and there were obvious signs of an error. – (I believe the data sent to us would have been from the authority).

To solve this issue, I rebuilt the background data for Tower Hamlets 2022 data using ONS provided raw data.

The variances after the rebuild were much more acceptable and within tolerance levels of consistency. However, the Whitechapel ward was still at a high negative variance level.

Earlier today it was mentioned that the ward had data split into two constituencies – (1. Bethnal Green and Bow 2. Poplar and Limehouse) in which the total would produce the correct electorate level reducing the variance. I have

now done this, and I am happy with the data for tower hamlets as it is now all consistent.

However, this does mean that the authority would now not meet the intervention criteria. (as Whitechapel is no longer above the 30% threshold) I have now noted down on how to spot this error and how to avoid it from repeating in other cases.

Let me know if there are any other questions.

Kind regards,

**Ram Avtaar**

GIS & Data Officer

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Windsor House  
50 Victoria Street  
London SW1H 0TL

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

The  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to give us your views.

**From:** [Evison, Alison](#)  
**To:** [Hendry, Angela](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council  
**Date:** 13 July 2023 11:07:39  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)

---

**From:** Evison, Alison <[alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Sent:** 01 November 2022 16:07  
**To:** Robert Curtis <[Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>  
**Cc:** Ram Avtaar <[ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council

Hi Robert,

Sorry for the delay in coming back to you on this. You are right, Tower Hamlets no longer meets our intervention criteria for review for the reasons that you said.

The December 2021 figures that were submitted which we considered when determining which authorities did meet the criteria were not accurate so we had to create our own dataset. However, as you say, the Whitechapel ward needed to be included in the Tower Hamlets ward which we had not initially done.

So to summarise – Tower Hamlets does not meet the review criteria and you will not be included in our programme.

My apologies for setting hares running unnecessarily – I will take this back to our board to explain the situation and we will write to your chief executive to formally withdraw the authority from our programme.

Thanks,  
Alison

---

**From:** Robert Curtis <[Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 01 November 2022 14:18  
**To:** Evison, Alison <[alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Cc:** Ram Avtaar <[ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Subject:** RE: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council

Hi Alison

Any updates on our query please?

Don't want to be in a position of telling our new administration that we are subject to a review and don't really fit the criteria

I can just see accusations flying in!!

Robert Curtis  
Head of Electoral Services  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
London  
E14 2BG  
Direct line: 020 7364 3139  
Office: 020 7364 0872  
<http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/vote>

### **Apply to Register to Vote**

(To apply to register to vote click on the **Your vote matters** icon below and this will take you to the governments secure web page)



### **Social media**

[https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgn/council\\_and\\_democracy/Website/social\\_media.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/lgn/council_and_democracy/Website/social_media.aspx)

[Twitter](#): @TowerHamletsNow

[Facebook](#): Tower Hamlets Council

[Instagram](#): @towerhamletsnow

[LinkedIn](#): London Borough of Tower Hamlets

[Youtube](#): Tower Hamlets Council

[Flickr](#): Tower Hamlets Council

### **Please note:**

We will only use the information you give us for electoral purposes. We will look after personal information securely and we will follow the principles of Data Protection legislation. We will not give personal information about you or any personal information you may provide on other people to anyone else or another organisation unless we have to by law.

The lawful basis is that it is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest and exercise of official authority by either the Electoral Registration Officer or Returning Officer (the data controllers) as set out in Representation of the People Act 1983 and associated regulations.

Further information relating to the Councils Privacy Policy and Data Protection can be accessed at

[https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/content\\_pages/legal\\_notices/legal\\_notices.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/content_pages/legal_notices/legal_notices.aspx)

---

**From:** Evison, Alison <[alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk)>

**Sent:** 25 October 2022 09:43

**To:** Robert Curtis <[Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Ram Avtaar <[ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:ram.avtaar@lgbce.org.uk)>



**Subject:** RE: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council

Thanks Robert,

I'll look into the points you've made and will come back to you.

Alison

**Alison Evison**  
**Review & Programme Manager**  
0330 500 1270

My usual working days are Tuesday to Friday.

The  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to give us your views.

---

**From:** Robert Curtis <[Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 23 October 2022 10:42

**To:** Will Tuckley <[Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Paul Hallett <[Paul.Hallett@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Hallett@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>; Stacey Kennedy-Clarke <[Stacey.Kennedy-Clarke@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Stacey.Kennedy-Clarke@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>; Evison, Alison <[alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:alison.evison@lgbce.org.uk)>; Lynne Spillett <[Lynne.Spillett@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Lynne.Spillett@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council

**Importance:** High

Good morning Will

Lovely day sat looking at the torrential rain and a hose pipe ban still in force here!!!

I've been through the data as specified in the letter from the LGBCE and 3 wards do fall outside the 10% threshold namely Canary Wharf, Bromley North and Whitechapel but the rest are pretty consistent

These are colour coded red in the spreadsheet attached which I've been working on this weekend and are 23.33% (CW), -13.27% (BN) and -13.93% (WC) and I will be discussing this at length with Paul and Stacey to expand on the data going back to 2014/15 so that we can look at

the trends in more detail year on year.

The miscalculation by the LGBCE is understandable for Whitechapel, they have quoted **-30.7%**, because they have not taken into consideration that polling district WH4P falls within the Poplar and Limehouse Constituency but it sits in the Whitechapel Borough Ward which predominantly falls into the Parliamentary Constituency of Bethnal Green & Bow.

They needed to add this figure (2,359) to the overall Borough figure calculated for Whitechapel which then increases the Borough total for that Ward to 11,637.

I've highlighted this cell in blue and it then falls into the **13.9%** they have quoted in their table for 2021.

If that 2,359 isn't added then the percentage actually falls to **-31.38%** which is not correct.

This means we have two Borough Wards with variances lower than 10% (BN & WC) and one with a variance higher (CW) representing 15% of the total Borough.

The 2022/23 electoral register will be published for 1 December this year and we will look at the figures again as we do each year but based on the above I don't think we fit the requirements for a review and I have cc'd in Alison so that we can discuss and I'll update when I've had that conversation with her.

I hope this helps

Robert Curtis  
Head of Electoral Services  
London Borough of Tower Hamlets  
Mulberry Place  
5 Clove Crescent  
London  
E14 2BG  
Direct line: 020 7364 3139  
Office: 020 7364 0872  
<http://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/vote>

### **Apply to Register to Vote**

(To apply to register to vote click on the **Your vote matters** icon below and this will take you to the governments secure web page)



### **Social media**

[https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ign/council\\_and\\_democracy/Website/social\\_media.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/ign/council_and_democracy/Website/social_media.aspx)

**Twitter:** @TowerHamletsNow

**Facebook:** Tower Hamlets Council

**Instagram:** @towerhamletsnow

[LinkedIn](#): London Borough of Tower Hamlets

[Youtube](#): Tower Hamlets Council

[Flickr](#): Tower Hamlets Council

### Important update:

### Corona Virus (COVID19)

Due to the above the electoral services team are now working from home until the foreseeable future. All emails are still being monitored and will be answered as soon as is reasonable practicable but this may take a little longer than expected but telephone calls will not be answered until we return. Please accept our apologies for any delay and any inconvenience this may cause but these are unprecedented times.



**Please note:** We will only use the information you give us for electoral purposes. We will look after personal information securely and we will follow the principles of Data Protection legislation. We will not give personal information about you or any personal information you may provide on other people to anyone else or another organisation unless we have to by law.

The lawful basis is that it is necessary for the performance of a task carried out in the public interest and exercise of official authority by either the Electoral Registration Officer or Returning Officer (the data controllers) as set out in Representation of the People Act 1983 and associated regulations.

Further information relating to the Councils Privacy Policy and Data Protection can be accessed at

[https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/content\\_pages/legal\\_notices/legal\\_notices.aspx](https://www.towerhamlets.gov.uk/content_pages/legal_notices/legal_notices.aspx)

---

**From:** Will Tuckley <[Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Sent:** 21 October 2022 14:07

**To:** Robert Curtis <[Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Robert.Curtis@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** Fwd: Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council

Rob,

See attached - suggesting a boundary review next year. Can you have the data checked please? This has been triggered by the disparity in the number for Whitechapel that seems to have worsened compared to the rest. This doesn't make that much sense to me (unless it's students?) To avoid a review we would need to show the number is wrong or the trend for that ward will be reversed by housebuilding (there will be some) or an expected rise in registration .

Thanks

Will

Sent from [Outlook for iOS](#)

---

**From:** reviews <[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 21, 2022 12:23:54 PM  
**To:** Will Tuckley <[Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk](mailto:Will.Tuckley@towerhamlets.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Electoral Review of Tower Hamlets Council



Dear Will,

Please find letter attached.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jolyon Jackson".

**Jolyon Jackson CBE**  
**Chief Executive**  
[jolyon.jackson@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:jolyon.jackson@lgbce.org.uk)  
0330 500 1290

Local Government Boundary Commission for England, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Windsor House, 50 Victoria Street, London, SW1H 0TL

Tel: 0330 500 1525; Fax: 0330 500 1526; [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk); [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**LGBCE (22-23)068**

<b>Report to</b>	Commission Board meeting on 20 September 2022
<b>From</b>	Alison Evison: Review & Programme Manger
<b>Appendix A</b>	Outline five-year review programme
<b>Appendix B</b>	Five-year variance history of the 32 authorities that meet the intervention criteria
<b>For decision</b>	The Commission Board is invited to consider the recommendations in the report

**Summary**

1. This paper sets out the 32 authorities that meet the intervention criteria using the December 2021 electoral registers. The team recommends including 12 of these authorities in its 2023/24 programme.
2. There are already 12 authorities in the Commission's 2023/24 programme. The team recommends adding 12 'intervention' authorities bringing the total number of reviews starting in 2023/24 to 24.
3. The Commission typically starts 25 reviews a year. Identifying 24 authorities leaves space for additional reviews following requests from local authorities or following government interventions.
4. The Commission has already agreed a number of PER reviews for the 2023/24 programme (some of these also meet the intervention criteria) and these authorities also populate the Commission's electoral review programme in later years. There are no additional PERs to add to the 2023/24 programme. The outline five year programme of reviews is included at Appendix A.

## Summary of team's recommendations for the 2023/24 programme

5. The team recommends the following 12 authorities that meet the Commission's intervention criteria are included in the Commission's 2023/24 electoral review programme. These are listed broadly in order of priority:
  1. Cheshire East – high positive variance
  2. Swindon – high positive variance
  3. Middlesbrough – high positive variance
  4. Vale of White Horse – high positive variance
  5. Tower Hamlets – high negative variance
  6. Colchester – high positive variance
  7. Canterbury – high negative variances
  8. Newcastle upon Tyne – high positive variance
  9. Breckland – high negative variance
  10. Milton Keynes – generally poor variances
  11. Bromsgrove – generally poor variances
  12. North West Leicestershire – generally poor variances
  
6. The **Board is invited to include 12 'intervention' authorities in the 2023/24 review programme.**

## Intervention authorities

There are 32 authorities that meet the intervention criteria, that are not currently in the programme and have not been reviewed in the last five years and which are not in North Yorkshire, Cumbria or Somerset.

**Table 1: Authorities meeting the intervention criteria on December 2021 data**

\* indicates team recommendation to include them in the 2023/24 programme

	Authority	Authority Type	County Council	Electoral Cycle	Year of all out election	No wards over 30%	% wards over 10%	Date of last review	Reviewed in the last 14 years?
1.	Cheshire East*	Unitary District	N/A	Whole	2027/2031	1	33%	July 2010	Yes
2.	Darlington	Unitary District	N/A	Whole	2027/2031	0	30%	August 2014	Yes
3.	Leeds	Metropolitan District	N/A	Thirds	n/a	1	12%	July 2017	Yes
4.	Middlesbrough*	Unitary District	N/A	Whole	2027/2031	1	25%	November 2013	Yes
5.	Milton Keynes*	Unitary District	N/A	Thirds	n/a	0	37%	June 2013	Yes
6.	Newcastle upon Tyne*	Metropolitan District	N/A	Thirds	n/a	1	31%	July 2017	Yes
7.	Southwark	London Borough	N/A	Whole	2026/2030	1	26%	July 2016	Yes
8.	Swindon*	Unitary District	N/A	Thirds	n/a	1	20%	September 2011	Yes
9.	Tower Hamlets*	London Borough	N/A	Whole	2026/2030	1	15%	March 2013	Yes
10.	Cambridgeshire	Two-Tier County	Cambridgeshire	Whole	2025/2029	2	34%	October 2016	Yes
11.	Huntingdonshire	Two-Tier District	Cambridgeshire	Whole	2026/2030	2	38%	November 2016	Yes
12.	Devon	Two-Tier County	Devon	Whole	2025/2029	1	34%	January 2016	Yes
13.	Torridge	Two-Tier District	Devon	Whole	2023/2029	0	44%	July 2017	Yes
14.	Wealden	Two-Tier District	East Sussex	Whole	2023/2029	1	34%	December 2016	Yes
15.	Colchester*	Two-Tier District	Essex	Thirds	n/a	1	35%	March 2015	Yes
16.	Cotswold	Two-Tier District	Gloucestershire	Whole	2023/2029	0	31%	October 2014	Yes

17.	Winchester	Two-Tier District	Hampshire	Thirds	n/a	0	44%	June 2015	Yes
18.	Watford	Two-Tier District	Hertfordshire	Thirds	n/a	0	33%	December 2015	Yes
19.	Canterbury*	Two-Tier District	Kent	Whole	2023/2029	2	67%	August 2014	Yes
20.	Folkestone and Hythe	Two-Tier District	Kent	Whole	2023/2029	0	38%	January 2014	Yes
21.	Swale	Two-Tier District	Kent	Whole	2023/2029	0	33%	August 2012	Yes
22.	Lancashire	Two-Tier County	Lancashire	Whole	2025/2029	3	33%	April 2016	Yes
23.	North West Leicestershire*	Two-Tier District	Leicestershire	Whole	2025/2029	0	32%	25 February 2014	yes
24.	West Lindsey	Two-Tier District	Lincolnshire	Whole	2023/2029	0	30%	September 2011	Yes
25.	Breckland*	Two-Tier District	Norfolk	Whole	2023/2029	1	37%	July 2014	Yes
26.	South Norfolk	Two-Tier District	Norfolk	Whole	2023/2029	2	42%	July 2017	Yes
27.	Nottinghamshire	Two-Tier County	Nottinghamshire	Whole	2025/2029	1	25%	July 2016	Yes
28.	Vale of White Horse*	Two-Tier District	Oxfordshire	Whole	2023/2029	1	42%	March 2013	Yes
29.	Eastbourne	Two-Tier District	East Sussex	Whole	2023/2029	0	33%	December 2016	Yes
30.	Rugby	Two-Tier District	Warwickshire	Thirds	n/a	0	31%	September 2011	Yes
31.	Warwickshire	Two-Tier County	Warwickshire	Whole	2025/2029	1	28%	February 2015	Yes
32.	Bromsgrove*	Two-Tier District	Worcestershire	Whole	2023/2029	1	27%	June 2013	Yes

\*North Yorkshire, Cumbria, Somerset authorities and the Isle of Scilly have been removed from this list



### Intervention reviews – team approach:

7. In considering which of these ‘intervention’ authorities to review, the team has considered amongst other issues the following factors:
  - **Electoral cycle**
  - **Extent of electoral imbalance**
  - **Positive variance or Negative variance** (positive variances are less likely to improve over time)
  - **Time since last review**
  - **Type of authority**
8. The team has undertaken an investigation in to the authorities that meet the intervention criteria. There are a number of authorities that have high positive variances i.e. have significantly more electors than the average– these have been prioritised for inclusion in the programme given the low likelihood that these variances will improve.
9. The team is not recommending any of the five County Councils for inclusion in the programme. County Councils elect in 2025/2029. While there is just sufficient time to include them in the 2023/24 programme for a 2025 election there would not be a lot of contingency for further consultation/delays and there would be a risk of not meeting the 2025 election. 2023/24 is too early to start a review of an authority that will implement its new arrangements in 2029 given the length of time from the review finishing and the first election. Accordingly, the team recommends re-visiting the inclusion of county councils next year.
10. Because the Commission has included a significant number of ‘PER’ authorities in its five year programme there are fewer authorities that meet the intervention criteria *and* which have not been reviewed in over 12 – 16 years. The team considers that it would not be appropriate in most circumstances to review those authorities that were reviewed in the last seven years as there should be more time for these authorities to reach the forecast electorate figures used during the review. The exception to this is Colchester (Essex) which the team is recommending is reviewed given the high variance in one ward. Colchester elected its last set of electoral arrangements in 2018. A new review would be implemented in 2026 or 2027 (8 or 9 years on existing arrangements).

11. The team recognises that of the 32 authorities that meet the Commission's intervention criteria, there are fewer that appear to be immediately in need of review – some authorities only just meet the threshold for review and have been reviewed in the last eight years. If, having considered the authorities that the team recommends including in its 2023/24 programme the Board considers that not all should be included in the programme an alternative approach to populating the 2023/24 programme is to bring forward some of the PER authorities which are currently earmarked for 2024/2025.

## **Conclusion**

12. The approach to identifying authorities in the 2023/24 programme as set out in this paper seeks to reflect the Commission's desire and capacity to remain flexible and responsive to local authorities' requests and the potential establishment of new authorities. A combination of intervention, PER and new authorities will populate the 2023/24 programme. There is capacity to undertake additional reviews throughout the year following any requests from local authorities or following the establishment of new authorities or following Government intervention.

**Alison Evison**

**Review & Programme Manager**

**September 2022**