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Summary

Who we are and what we do

1 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.

2 Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

3 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 Copeland?

4 We are conducting a review of Copeland Borough Council as a result of a request from the authority in order that the number of councillors elected to the authority could be examined.

Our proposals for Copeland

- Copeland should be represented by 33 councillors, 18 fewer than there are now.
- Copeland should have 18 wards, seven fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of all of the wards will change.

Have your say

5 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for a ten-week period, from 3 April 2018 to 11 June 2018. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to contribute to the design of the new wards – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the views we received.

6 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

You have until 11 June 2018 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 25 for how to send us your response.
What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

8 The members of the Commission are:

• Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
• Susan Johnson OBE
• Alison Lowton
• Peter Maddison QPM
• Steve Robinson
• Andrew Scallan CBE

• Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

9 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Copeland are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

What is an electoral review?

10 Our three main considerations are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

11 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

12 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Copeland. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

13 This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 November 2017</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 November 2017</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 February 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendaions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 April 2018</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 June 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendaions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 August 2018</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendaions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

14 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation\(^2\) states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors\(^3\) there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for ourwards.

16 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

17 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Copeland</td>
<td>54,463</td>
<td>56,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electors per councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. Two of our proposed wards will have variances greater than 10% by 2023.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

20 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

21 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2023, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2018. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 5% by 2023.

---


\(^3\) Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

**Number of councillors**

23 Copeland Borough Council currently has 51 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by Mayor Starkie and the Copeland Labour Party (‘the Labour Party’) and concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by 18, to a council size of 33, will enable the Council to carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

24 Mayor Starkie’s proposal to reduce the number of members by 18 was supported by the Copeland Conservative Party (‘the Conservative Party’). The Labour Party proposed a council size of 42; however, we were not persuaded by the evidence they provided to consider addressing the issue of council size again.

25 We supported the Mayor’s view of how those 33 councillors would ensure effective decision-making and would be able to provide an effective representational role across the borough.

26 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 33 councillors – for example, ten one-councillor wards and one three-councillor ward, or a mix of one-, two- and three-councillor wards.

27 We received six submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on ward patterns. We received submissions from Bootle Parish Council and two local residents who were in support of our proposed council size of 33. However, we did receive three submissions which proposed alternative council sizes; a local resident requested that the council size should be further reduced to 24. The Labour Party opposed the Mayor’s recommendation for 33 councillors, explaining that under the Constitution the Mayor can appoint between two and nine members to sit on the executive. Noting that the current Mayor has appointed three members, however, the proposed Council size of 33 would restrict any future increase in appointments to the executive.

28 During the initial warding pattern consultation, the Labour Party made a number of further comments regarding council size. It requested that the minimum council size be 39, as this would allow the possibility for nine members to be appointed to the executive and ensure that members did not serve on more than one of the major committees. We also received a submission from a local resident who provided support for the Labour Party’s original proposal for a council size of 42.

29 We were not persuaded by the evidence provided to adopt an alternative council size and we are therefore confirming our recommendation for a council size of 33 councillors.

**Ward boundaries consultation**

30 We received 34 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included five borough-wide proposals. The Council, Mayor
Starkie, the Copeland Constituency Labour Party (‘the Labour Party’) and the Conservative Party proposed schemes which were identical in many areas and a borough-wide scheme from the Conservative Association.

31 The Council proposed a mixed pattern of 18 wards, with all except one of their wards expected to produce good variances by 2023.

32 Mayor Starkie’s proposals were identical to the Council’s proposals except in the south where he proposed splitting up the Council’s proposed two-councillor South Copeland ward into two smaller one-councillor wards.

33 The Labour Party explicitly noted that it opposed a council size of 33. However, it provided a proposal for wards to the Commission were a council size of 33 to be agreed. The Labour Party noted that while the boundaries it proposed were identical to the Council’s submission, it gave further evidence to support the Council’s proposed ward names.

34 The Conservative Party focused on the mid and south Copeland areas and proposed three alternative wards to those proposed by the Council in this area. It also included the same proposals in the north of the borough as the Council. We received submissions from Drigg & Carleton Parish Council and Waberthwaite & Corney Parish Council which were identical to the Conservatives Party’s submission.

35 The Conservative Association proposed a mixed pattern of 16 wards, which would produce wards with good variances; however, it was not supported by any evidence of community identities.

36 We received a number of general submissions from individuals including a submission from a local resident requesting that the area of Whitehaven be represented by eight councillors and that the rural areas be represented by one-councillor wards. There was a submission regarding the inclusion of Millom within Copeland which we understand to be a reference to the parliamentary boundary review for which we are not responsible. We also received a submission requesting a unitary pattern of local government, which the Commission cannot recommend as part of this electoral review.

37 Our draft recommendations are largely based on the schemes from the Council, Mayor Starkie, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party which we note are largely the same.

38 In Whitehaven we have made some minor amendments to reflect the county divisions and have made a more significant amendment to improve the boundary proposed.

39 Our draft recommendations are for 18 wards: six three-councillor wards, three two-councillor wards and nine one-councillor wards. 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.

40 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on pages 33 - 36 and on the large map accompanying this report.

41 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly in relation to the areas of Gosforth and Seascale and the proposed Hensingham & Hillcrest ward that we identified in Whitehaven. We also welcome views on the names of our proposed wards.

Draft recommendations

42 The tables and maps on pages 10 - 25 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Copeland Borough Council. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory\(^4\) criteria of:

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

### Ward name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corkickle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensingham &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identical proposals we received for Whitehaven from the Council, Mayor Starkie, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party would produce good electoral variances by 2023. The Conservative Association submitted a scheme for Whitehaven which included part of St Bees parish. It did not submit any evidence in support of its proposed wards which had good levels of electoral equality. We received a submission from a local resident requesting that the area of Whitehaven be represented by eight councillors.

Our proposed wards for Whitehaven are based on the identical proposals received which we note for some wards are the same as the Conservative Party’s submission. The Labour Party did not consider that including parts of other parishes in Whitehaven wards would reflect community identities and we agree. We are adopting the scheme as submitted by the identical submissions as the wards generally provide good electoral equality and have a good level of support.

However, we have identified an amendment as a result of our tour of the area where we noted that the boundary which the Council proposed between its Hensingham and Hillcrest wards ran through the middle of a housing area. We consider that those living along Balmoral Road, Caldbeck Road and Jubilee Road share a community identity and naturally look towards the school along Red Lonning. We were not satisfied that the identical proposal is based on strong and clearly identifiable boundaries and we are concerned that this may divide the community in the area. Therefore, we are proposing our own warding arrangements in this area; a one-councillor Rosebank ward in the south and a three-councillor Hensingham & Hillcrest ward in the north that will produce variances of 1% and -8% by 2023 respectively.

We received no evidence to specifically provide eight councillors to Whitehaven ward and note that this would provide significant under-representation to the area, and we are not persuaded to adopt this proposal.

On our tour of the area we noted that the properties along Monkwray Brow and The Gardens look more towards the areas of Kells, rather than towards Whitehaven town centre with which the identical proposals included them. We considered including these electors in the Kells ward, but this would push Kells ward to have a variance of 17%. In light of the fact that the identical proposals provide for a good reflection of the statutory criteria across the town we are not minded to make any amendments to address this. The identical proposals in this area which we are adopting as part of our draft recommendations are for a one-councillor Kells ward and a three-councillor Whitehaven South ward with variances of 7% and 9% respectively. We have changed the ward name to Whitehaven South (rather than South Whitehaven) to provide consistency of the ward names within Whitehaven.

We are adopting the Council’s proposed Corkickle and Whitehaven Central wards, with minor alterations to create boundaries that are coterminous with the county divisions and to improve the boundary ensuring that electors can directly access the rest of the ward in which they reside. This will create a one-councillor
Corkickle ward and a three-councillor Whitehaven Central ward that will produce variances of -5% and -8% by 2023.

49 We have based our wards on the identical proposals for this area because they provided wards with good variances and relatively strong boundaries. However, we consider that we received limited evidence of community identities in support of those wards and we invite further information in response to our draft recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arlecdon &amp; Ennerdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frizington &amp; Moresby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50 The identical proposals we received in this area (from the Council, Mayor Starkie, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party) were for three wards which the respondents considered combined areas with similar characteristics. These wards would provide for good variances by 2023. The Conservative Association proposed four wards using whole parishes which would also provide for good electoral equality. We received a submission from Moresby Parish Council, requesting that the parish be wholly retained in a ward that reflected its parish boundaries. We also received a submission from the Howgate Distington Partnership that requested that Moresby, Lowca, Parton and Distington parishes be united in one three-councillor ward.

51 The Commission has agreed to adopt the identical proposals in this area. The Commission notes that the three wards provide relatively good electoral equality and have some evidence of community identity in support of them.

52 When considering these wards, the Commission noted that the proposed Frizington & Moresby ward as outlined in the identical submissions includes the northern part of Weddicar parish. There are only 38 electors forecast to be in this part of the parish by 2023. The Commission is required, by statute, to create parish wards where it divides a parish between borough wards. The Commission generally does not consider that a warding pattern that results in a parish ward with fewer than around 100 electors should be adopted as it would require a single parish councillor to represent just these few electors. Accordingly, we looked at alternative warding patterns.

53 Firstly, we considered including the whole of Weddicar parish in a ward to the south. However, we note that the north of Weddicar parish is rural in nature and that there is no direct access to the south of the parish and that there would therefore be no access from the north of Weddicar parish to the rest of the ward.

54 The Commission could not identify a scheme where the parish is united in one ward where those electors living in the north of the parish would have access to the electors in the south of the parish. The Commission considers that the north of the parish has closer links, both in terms of road access but also in terms of community identity to those parishes which the identical schemes proposed to include it with, than any area to the south.

55 We considered the Conservative Association’s proposal which united Weddicar parish in one ward to the north. However, as well the issue of the electors in the south of Weddicar parish not having access to the remainder of the ward, we note that it would have a significant knock-on effect to the warding pattern proposed by the identical schemes in the remainder of this area of Copeland. We consider these wards are preferable to the Conservative Association’s wards because they have been supported by four different groups and have some evidence of community identity to support them. The Conservative Association provided no evidence in support of any of its proposed wards.

56 We note Howgate Distington Partnership consider that Moresby parish should be included with the three other parishes in this area and that Moresby Parish
Council consider that Moresby parish should form a single ward. In light of our recommendations in this area, there would be a significant knock-on effect on electoral equality to our proposed Frizington & Moresby ward and we are therefore not proposing to adopt either of these proposals.

57 We recognise the Arlecdon & Ennerdale ward is geographically large but this is a reflection of the rural nature of the ward and we are content to adopt this locally proposed and supported ward with a good level of electoral equality.

58 Our draft recommendations are for a one-councillor Arlecdon & Ennerdale ward, a two-councillor Distington ward and a two-councillor Frizington & Moresby ward with 2% more, 10% fewer and 7% more electors than the average by 2023, respectively. The Council proposed the ward name of North Copeland. However, we have chosen to adopt the Conservative Association’s proposed ward name of Distington as we generally consider it is better in this area to specify a settlement rather than use the generic ‘North Copeland’. We do, however, invite further representations on ward names during the consultation.
### Ward name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egremont &amp; Cleator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moor Row &amp; Bigrigg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cleator Moor, Egremont & Cleator, Moor Row & Bigrigg and St Bees

59 The identical proposals we received in this area (from the Council, Mayor Starkie, the Conservative Party and the Labour Party) were for four wards, including a Moor Row & Bigrigg ward which included a variance of 11% and included the southern part of Weddicar parish. The Conservative Association’s proposal was similar but excluded the whole of Weddicar parish from this area.

60 The other five submissions we received in this area, from Cleator Moor Town Council, Cleator Moor Chamber of Trade and three local residents considered that Cleator Moor parish should not be included with other parishes in a ward. They proposed that either the whole of Cleator Moor parish be retained in one ward or that the existing Cleator Moor North and Cleator Moor South wards be retained. These respondents opposed the inclusion of any part of the parish with Egremont town as they considered that the areas had very little in common and that it would be to the detriment of Cleator Moor residents. The Labour Party also indicated that it would be preferable to use the external boundaries of the parish for the ward. But it considered that an area would need to be transferred out of the parish to provide for good levels of electoral equality and that the area of Cleator is ‘recognisable and gives sensible warding within the pattern’.

61 The Commission has found it hard to identify warding patterns in this area. We recognise the views held in support of retaining Cleator Moor parish in one ward. A three-councillor Cleator Moor ward comprising the whole parish would have a variance of 13% by 2023. Retaining the existing wards would result in wards with variances of 26% and 7%. We note the views provided by the five respondents but we have not been persuaded by the evidence of community identity to justify such imbalance, especially in light of the identical proposals received that recommend separating the Cleator area into a ward with the town of Egremont. We agree with the identical proposals that state that Cleator has links with Egremont, including direct road access, and are proposing to adopt the identical submissions for a three-councillor Cleator Moor ward and a three-councillor Egremont & Cleator ward which will both have variances of 4% by 2023.

62 The identical submissions proposed a one-councillor Moor Row & Bigrigg ward comprising the villages of Moor Row, Bigrigg and the southern part of Weddicar parish around Keekle. As described above, the Commission would not usually adopt a warding pattern that required a parish ward with fewer than 100 electors. However, if we were to include the whole of Weddicar parish in this ward it would result in a ward with 15% more electors and would leave those electors in the north of Weddicar parish in a ward with which they had no access. The Commission did not receive any alternative proposals for this area and as a result of the warding pattern that we have proposed in the surrounding areas we are proposing to adopt this ward.

63 We would not normally recommend a ward with such a poor variance unless it was supported by excellent evidence of community identity. However, we recognise that this ward is proposed by the four proponents of the identical scheme and that there are limited options in the area. We do not consider that the 13% can be
improved by including areas of Egremont into a Whitehaven ward as we consider the areas are distinctly different and the parish boundary here is very strong. We also considered whether we could include part of Egremont parish in the Cleator Moor ward but considered that this would not reflect community identity and that only that area of Cleator should breach the Cleator Moor parish boundary.

64 We note the proposal from the Conservative Association and two local residents to include Sandwith (which is part of Whitehaven parish) in a St Bees ward. However, we consider the parish boundaries should not be breached in this area and we do not propose to adopt this proposal. Instead we are adopting the St Bees ward as set out in the identical schemes. St Bees Parish Council also supported this ward which is forecast to have a variance of 6% by 2023.
### Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckermet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosforth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seascale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beckermet, Gosforth and Seascale

65 We received three different proposals for this area. The Council, Mayor Starkie and the Labour Party proposed an identical scheme comprising three single-councillor wards. The Conservative Party proposed one single-councillor ward and one two-councillor ward. The Conservative Association proposed two geographically large two-councillor wards. Four other submissions, from parish councils and local residents, requested a mixture of one- and two-councillor wards, with conflicting views on whether or not to combine smaller wards in the interest of reflecting community groups.

66 The identical schemes proposed three one-councillor wards, which would all produce good variances by 2023. The Labour Party who proposed these wards considered that they reflected the individual identities of the local area; they considered combining the proposed Gosforth and Seascale wards but felt that two separate wards in this area would better reflect the individual communities.

67 The Conservative Party’s warding pattern was different and proposed expanding the existing Beckermet ward; however, this would produce a variance of 14% by 2023. It also proposed a geographically large two-councillor Mid Copeland ward with a variance of -9%. In light of the alternative wards that provide better electoral equality we do not propose adopting the Conservative Party’s scheme.

68 Beckermet with Thornhill Parish Council requested that the existing Beckermet ward be retained, with a couple of slight boundary alterations. It proposed that the whole of Ponsonby parish should be included within its ward. However, this proposal would create a two-councillor ward with a variance over -20% by 2023 and we are therefore not adopting it.

69 We received a submission from Ponsonby Parish Council requesting that it should be not be split across two wards. We also received separate submissions from local residents requesting better representation for the Seascale area, that the areas of Seascale and Gosforth be combined into the same ward, and that the areas of Bootle and Ravenglass be combined into the same ward. There was very little evidence provided in any of these submissions to support their proposals.

70 We have chosen to adopt the proposals to create three wards as proposed by the Council, Mayor Starkie and the Labour Party; a one-councillor Beckermet ward, a one-councillor Gosforth ward and a one-councillor Seascale ward that will produce variances of 5%, 1% and 0% by 2023, respectively. While our proposals do not include Ponsonby parish with Beckermet (due to poor variances), it will retain the whole of Ponsonby parish within one ward. We acknowledge the requests to combine the areas of Seascale and Gosforth; however, at this stage of the review we were not persuaded by the evidence received to combine these areas. If the wards of Gosforth and Seascale were combined into a two-councillor ward, it would produce a variance of 1% by 2023. However, we invite evidence to justify combining what we consider to be two separate areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Combe &amp; Scafell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Black Combe & Scafell and Millom**

71 We received four different warding patterns for the southern area of Copeland. The Council proposed a two-councillor South Copeland ward and a three-councillor Millom ward that reflected the town of Millom and combined the existing wards of Holborn and Hill; these wards would produce variances of 5% and -6% by 2023, respectively. These wards were supported by the Labour Party, which noted support for combining the existing wards around Millom town to create one ward.

72 Mayor Starkie proposed an identical Millom ward to the Council and Labour Party but recommended splitting the proposed South Copeland ward into two one-councillor wards; a Scafell ward and Black Combe ward which would produce variances of 6% and -2% by 2023. He noted that those in Black Combe would naturally look towards Millom for their resources, whereas those in Scafell would look to both Millom and Egremont town.

73 The Conservative Party proposed a two-councillor South Copeland West ward and three-councillor South Copeland East ward, which would produce variances of 13% and 5% respectively. This submission was identical to those we received from Drigg & Carleton Parish Council and Waberthwaite & Corney Parish Council.

74 The Conservative Association proposed two large wards both with good variances, but these comprised parishes across the width of the borough without any evidence of community identity.

75 We also received submissions from Millom Without Parish Council and Bootle Parish Council, requesting that the whole of their respective parishes should be included in the same ward.

76 We noted that the Mayor’s proposals would divide Millom Without parish and that there is no community identity evidence to persuade us that only the northern part of the parish should be included in the remainder of the very rural part of the ward to the north. We were not persuaded by the Conservative Party’s proposal which had poorer electoral equality and little evidence to justify it. We are also not proposing to adopt the Conservative Association’s proposal which is very large without any evidence of community identity.

77 We are adopting the Council’s proposal in this area with a name change. We are proposing a two-councillor Black Combe & Scafell ward and a three-councillor Millom ward that will produce variances of 2% and -9% by 2023. We are proposing to change the name to Black Combe & Scafell as we consider that the mountainous geography of the area is more descriptive of the area than South Copeland.
Conclusions

The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2017 and 2023 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>1,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 30% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft recommendation**

Copeland Borough Council should be made up of 33 councillors serving 18 wards representing nine single-councillor wards, three two-councillor wards and six three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

**Mapping**

Sheet 1, Map 1 shows the proposed wards for Copeland Borough Council. You can also view our draft recommendations for Copeland Borough Council on our interactive maps at [http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)
Parish electoral arrangements

79 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 wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

80 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, Copeland Borough Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

81 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 Cleator Moor Town Council, Drigg and Carleton Parish Council, Lowside Quarter Parish Council, Weddicar Parish Council and Whitehaven Town Council.

82 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 Cleator Moor parish.

Draft recommendation
Cleator Moor Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing three wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleator Moor Town</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
83 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 Drigg and Carleton parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Drigg and Carleton Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drigg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84 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 Lowside Quarter parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Lowside Quarter Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braystones</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethertown</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

85 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 Weddicar parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Weddicar Parish Council should comprise eight councillors, as at present, representing two wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weddicar North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keekle</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Whitehaven parish.

**Draft recommendation**
Whitehaven Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, one more than it currently has, representing 12 wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corkickle North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corkickle South</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillcrest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kells</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirehouse East</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirehouse West</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebank North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosebank South</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven Central North</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven Central South</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehaven South</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Have your say

87 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole borough or just a part of it.

88 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for Copeland Borough Council, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

89 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

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

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

91 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Copeland Borough Council name 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

92 A good pattern of wards 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

93 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

94 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?

95 Effective local government:

• Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
• Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
• Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

96 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 (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.

97 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.

98 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.

99 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 all-out elections for Copeland Borough Council in 2019.

Equalities

100 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.
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Draft recommendations for Copeland Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2017)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2023)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Arlecdon &amp; Ennerdale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Beckermet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Black Combe &amp; Scafell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cleator Moor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>5,370</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Corkickle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Distington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,097</td>
<td>1,549</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Egremont &amp; Cleator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Frizington &amp; Moresby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3,676</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gosforth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>1,684</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hensingham &amp; Hillcrest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Kells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Millom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,593</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>4,712</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2017)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
<td>Electorate (2023)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Moor Row &amp; Bigrigg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Rosebank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Seascale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 St Bees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Whitehaven Central</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>4,754</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Whitehaven South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,291</td>
<td>1,764</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56,463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56,909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Copeland Borough 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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.
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Outline map
Key

1. Arlecdon & Ennerdale
2. Beckermet
3. Black Combe & Scafell
4. Cleator Moor
5. Corkickle
6. Distington
7. Egremont & Cleator
8. Frizington & Moresby
9. Gosforth
10. Hensingham & Hillcrest
11. Kells
12. Millom
13. Moor Row & Bigrigg
14. Rosebank
15. Seascale
16. St Bees
17. Whitehaven Central
18. Whitehaven South

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/north-west/cumbria/copeland
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Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/north-west/cumbria/copeland

Local Authority

- Copeland Borough Council

Political Groups

- Copeland Conservative Association
- Copeland Conservative Party
- Copeland Labour Party

Mayor

- Mayor Starkie

Local Organisations

- Cleator Moor Chamber of Trade
- Howgate Distington Partnership

Parish and Town Councils

- Beckermet with Thornhill Parish Council
- Bootle Parish Council
- Cleator Moor Town Council (1)
- Cleator Moor Town Council (2)
- Drigg and Carleton Parish Council
- Millom Without Parish Council
- Moresby Parish Council
- Ponsonby Parish Council
- St Bees Parish Council
- Waberthwaite and Corney Parish Council

Local Residents

- 17 local residents
<p>| <strong>Council size</strong> | The number of councillors elected to serve on a council |
| <strong>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</strong> | A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority |
| <strong>Division</strong> | 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 |
| <strong>Electoral fairness</strong> | When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s |
| <strong>Electoral inequality</strong> | Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority |
| <strong>Electorate</strong> | 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 |
| <strong>Number of electors per councillor</strong> | The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors |
| <strong>Over-represented</strong> | Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish council</td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish ward</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town council</td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented</td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance (or electoral variance)</td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government areas.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th floor, Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

Telephone: 0330 500 1525
Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Online: www.lgbce.org.uk or www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk
Twitter: @LGBCE