

Title of EIA/ DDM: Impact of Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) Draft Recommendations for wards in the City of Nottingham

Name of Author: Dean Goodburn

Director: Candida Brudenell

Department: Strategy & Resources

Service Area: Corporate Policy Team

Strategic Budget EIA Y/N (please underline)

Author (assigned to Covalent): Dean Goodburn

Brief description of proposal / policy / service being assessed:

Background

In July 2016, the LGBCE wrote to the Chief Executive to advise that Nottingham would be subject to an electoral review. In November 2016, representatives of the LGBCE met with the Chief Executive and Deputy Leader of Nottingham City Council to confirm the process and timetable for the review.

At December 2016, there were 204,355 registered electors in Nottingham City, an average of 3,715 electors for each of the 55 City Councillors. Nottingham is being reviewed on the basis that:

- 30% of the council's wards have an electoral imbalance of greater than +/-10% from the average ratio of electors to councillors for the city (Arboretum, Bilborough, Bridge, Clifton North, Dunkirk & Lenton and Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey wards);
- Two wards (Wollaton East & Lenton Abbey and Dunkirk & Lenton) have an electoral imbalance of greater than -30% from the average ratio for the city.

In line with the LGBCE's timetable for the review, the City Council submitted its view on a preferred Council size in May 2017, recommending the current council size of 55 Councillors is maintained. The LGBCE accepted this recommendation.

The LGBCE then announced a consultation on the pattern of wards in the city based on 55 Councillors, and the City Council was invited to submit its own proposals for a preferred warding pattern in Nottingham. A submission on behalf of the authority was approved at Full Council on 11 September 2017. It was submitted to the LGBCE 12 September 2017.

Proposals to be assessed

The LGBCE published its Draft Recommendations for a pattern of wards in Nottingham on 31 October 2017.

Their draft proposals breakdown as follows:

- Three-member wards: 14
- Two-member wards: 4
- Single member wards: 5
- Total number of proposed wards: 23

Of particular concern is that the LGGBCE has proposed 5 single member wards in the city: Arboretum, City Centre, Embankment, New Meadows and

Full details of their proposals are available here <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/east-midlands/nottinghamshire/nottingham>

Information used to analyse the effects on equality:

Citizen Survey, Consultation with Key Stakeholders, feedback from Ward Councillors and Local Residents, Indices of Deprivation, Census.

	Could particularly benefit X	May adversely impact X
People from different ethnic groups.	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Men	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Trans	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Disabled people or carers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pregnancy/ Maternity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People of different faiths/ beliefs and those with none.	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Lesbian, gay or bisexual people.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Older	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Younger	<input type="checkbox"/>	√
Other:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

How different groups could be affected (Summary of impacts)	Details of actions to reduce negative or increase positive impact (or why action isn't possible)
<p>The key impact resulting from the LGBCE's proposals for single member wards is that they will undermine cohesion in the city, based as they are on dividing wards on demographic, income and type of housing tenure lines.</p> <p>Nottingham is a diverse city, and the City Council is rightly proud of the hard work of our communities, local councillors and partner organisations to continue the high levels of community cohesion we have in</p>	<p><u>Actions to reduce negative impact of LGBCE proposals</u></p> <p>1. Multi member wards in the city allow for a diversity of elected representatives and ensure the</p>

Nottingham. The last Citizen Survey (2016/17) of local residents showed that 91% of respondents felt people from who different backgrounds got on well together in their local area.

Their proposals also risk already under-represented communities in Nottingham having their voices further diluted by proposing single member wards where the elected representative will not necessarily reflect the different communities within the ward, and may be unable to represent them to the fullest, for reasons of ethnicity, gender, language or religion.

The LGBCE's proposed single member wards will disadvantage those groups and communities overall, with the risk of poorer outcomes and unmet needs.

This is not appropriate for Nottingham and puts some of our most disadvantaged and vulnerable communities at risk of further disadvantage, by reducing their democratic representation, with potential negative impacts on cohesion and integration in the city.

A breakdown of the LGBCE's proposed wards single member wards by ethnicity is below:

	Pop/n	White British	White not British	Mixed ethn.	Asian or Asian British	Black or Black British	Other Ethnic group
Hyson Green	100.0	33.7	10.2	7.6	33.1	11.6	3.8
Arboretum	100.0	62.9	6.0	8.3	13.8	7.0	2.0
Embankment	100.0	52.9	7.8	7.1	21.6	9.6	1.0
New Meadows	100.0	51.4	9.2	9.8	13.8	13.0	2.8
Park	100.0	69.3	9.3	5.7	11.8	2.3	1.6
City	100.0	46.7	13.0	7.3	22.3	5.0	5.7

This shows that the wards are ethnically diverse, whilst their representation under the proposed single member wards will not be.

Under the LGBCE's proposals, the impact will be that areas are split along demographic, income and housing tenure lines. Replacing these multi-member wards, with their diversity of elected representation, with five single member wards and a two member Radford and Hyson Green wards will mean that already potentially under-represented and vulnerable groups in the city will not have their voices heard, with less influence in who their local representative is.

1. The proposed boundaries for the single wards do not match the community as understood locally.
2. For specific groups, such as the elderly, young families, the City Council and partners have structured our area working and services around these groups and communities.
3. Cohesion in the city is strong. If the proposed changes have the effect of segregating communities in any way, that will impact on cohesion in established, diverse communities.
4. Less diversity and choice of elected representative under the proposed single member wards will mean Councillors may not fully understand the needs of residents in their ward, due to barriers of language, culture and cultural norms, and therefore are unable to advocate for their service needs. Residents may

interests of our different communities and groups are properly heard and represented in the local democratic process. This helps to maintain and advance social cohesion in Nottingham.

2. Ensure targeted service provision and our current successful area working model, supported by partners such as the Police and NHS, continues, through matching boundaries to existing communities and multi-member wards.

3. Maintain multi-member wards to ensure that where a councillor is unable to discharge their duties for reasons of absence/ill health, there is always an elected representative for their local area that residents can turn to when they need assistance.

also be left having to approach a councillor where they may feel uncomfortable doing so for gender or religion, whereas multi-member wards with a mix allow for both men and women to approach the elected representative they feel most comfortable with.

5. All residents and communities within the five proposed single member wards will be left at risk of being un-represented for significant periods of time should the sole councillor for their ward be unable to undertake their duties as an elected representative for reasons of ill-health or absence.

Has consultation been done or planned for this proposal? •Completed •Planned

Has human rights legislation been considered in this proposal? •Yes •No

Outcome(s) of equality impact assessment:

•No major change needed •Adjust the policy/proposal •Adverse impact but continue
•Stop and remove the policy/proposal

Arrangements for future monitoring of equality impact of this proposal / policy / service:

Review when Final Recommendations released by LGBCE, following by annual review of indicators of impact by the Corporate Policy Team, through for example the Citizen Survey and or Nottingham Plan to 2020.

Approved by (manager signature):

Colin Monckton
Director of Strategy and Policy
Strategy and Resources
Tel: 0115 8764832
Email: colin.monckton@nottinghamcity.gov.uk

Date sent to equality team for publishing:
19.01.18

Before you send your EIA to the Equality and Community Relations Team for scrutiny, have you:

1. Read the guidance and good practice EIA's

<http://gossweb.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/nccextranet/index.aspx?articleid=9770>

2. Clearly summarised your proposal/ policy/ service to be assessed.

3. Hyperlinked to the appropriate documents.
4. Written in clear user friendly language, free from all jargon (spelling out acronyms).
5. Included appropriate data.
6. Consulted the relevant groups or citizens or stated clearly when this is going to happen.
7. Clearly cross referenced your impacts with SMART actions.