ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL
Electoral Review of South Ribble Borough Council

Introduction

Each year, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England audits the levels of electoral imbalances arising in each English local authority area in order to establish whether there is a need for an electoral review. Imbalances can arise from changing demographics and new developments, and movement of electors between local authority areas, as well as within individual areas.

There are two elements that the Commission takes into account when assessing the need for an electoral review. Both relate to the level of electoral representation within a local authority area. Electoral inequality exists when voters are either over-represented or under-represented by their local councillor(s) in relation to average levels of representation for the authority as a whole.

Under the criteria adopted by the Commission, if either of the following conditions is found to exist, then consideration is given to the need for a review:

- Any local authority with a division or ward that has an electoral variance in excess of 30%. This means a division or ward having at least 30% more (or less) electors in it than the average for the authority as a whole; and/or
- Any local authority where more than 30% of the divisions or wards have an electoral variance in excess of 10% from the average for that authority.

On the basis of the latest data available, our authority appears to meet the selection criteria, with 9 of our 27 wards (33%) having an electoral variance in excess of 10%.

The Commission therefore provisionally identified a date to start the review early in 2013 but prior to this there was a preliminary period when the Commission met with the Council to agree the precise nature of the review. These meetings took place in October 2012. At this stage the Commission asked the Council to formulate proposals for the Council size.

The Boundary Commission for England had identified that the Council’s electoral variance had triggered the Commission’s selection criteria as more than 33% of the borough’s wards have an electoral variance of 10%. Consequently the Commission is undertaking an electoral review of the Council.

Background to the Review

There are a number of stages to a review.

Firstly to consider the number of Councillors that is appropriate for the Council and to put forward to the Commission a proposal on the numbers.

Secondly, following the Commission’s consideration of the Council submission on the number of councillors, to work up further proposals for the Warding arrangements for the Council and submission of these arrangements to the Commission.

Thirdly, to consider the Commission’s response to the Council’s proposed warding arrangements.
In November 2012 the Council set up a Boundary Committee comprising 11 members, (six Conservative, four Labour and one Liberal Democrat) which reflected the Council’s political balance to deal with the three stages outlined above.

That Committee met on four occasions before making recommendations to the full council. (The minutes of these meetings are attached as Appendices A, B, C, and D).

The Council considered the recommendations of the Committee on Council size on 23 January 2013 and unanimously approved its recommendation for 50 Councillors. (An extract from the minutes of these meetings is attached as Appendix E).

The Council considered the recommendations of the Committee on the warding on 24 July 2013 and approved the warding arrangements as set out in this submission. (An extract from the minutes of these meetings is attached as Appendix F).

This submission reiterates the Council’s preferred option for the number of Councillors to be 50 and goes on to propose the warding arrangements for the Council.

**Council Size**

The Boundary Commission suggests the following key criteria for determining the size of the council:

- The decision-making process
- Quasi-judicial processes
- The scrutiny process
- The representative role of the elected member.

In this submission we address each of these key criteria to justify our proposal for a reduction in the number of elected councillors for South Ribble Borough Council from the current 55 to 50.

Attached are appendices showing Membership of Cabinet (Appendix G) and the Council’s Committees (Appendix H) and Representatives on Outside Bodies (Appendix I) at the time the decision on Council size was made.

**The Decision Making Process**

The Council moved from a Committee system to a Leader and Cabinet model, prior to 2000 in anticipation of the introduction of the 2000 Act.

Following consultation in 2010 it reconsidered its executive arrangements and moved to a Leader and Cabinet Executive model. This was adopted in November 2010 for implementation following the Council’s elections in May 2011.

The Council operates within a policy framework agreeing a corporate plan and budget annually and the Cabinet, working with the management team, is empowered to deliver them.
The Cabinet, which currently comprises a Leader and five councillors, has scheduled meetings approximately every two months.

During 2011/12 it met on six occasions to consider 45 reports, an average of 7.5 per meeting.

Cabinet reports the content of its meeting to each subsequent Council meeting and makes recommendations on matters not considered to be Executive decisions.

The decision making process appears to work effectively and efficiently and the impact of a change in councillor numbers from 55 to 50 is sustainable.

**Quasi-judicial processes**

The Council has a Planning Committee, currently comprising 15 councillors. The Committee meets approximately every three weeks to consider major applications and applications that the Director of Planning and Housing does not determine using delegated powers. In 2011/12, the Planning Committee considered 81 planning applications. It met 17 times, and on average considered just fewer than five applications per meeting.

We do not expect to see any significant reduction in its workload over the next few years and, in the event of an upturn in the economy, we may well see an increase. Looking forward to the period up to 2019 and beyond, with the anticipated end to the period of austerity and with central Lancashire considered to be an area of development (an Enterprise Zone and City Deal bidding in process), activity in this area could substantially increase. However, it is believed that this additional workload can be accommodated within the existing Committee.

The Council’s Licensing Act Committees, Licensing and General Licensing, are made up of 11 Councillors and met on 12 occasions in 2012, dealing with Council’s licensing policies and taxi matters.

Its Licensing Panel met on seven occasions dealing with a number of premises licences.

Again it is not anticipated that this level of activity will substantially change up to 2019.

The quasi-judicial process appears to work effectively and efficiently and has received positive reviews and feedback from the external auditors. The impact of a change in council numbers from 55 to 50 is sustainable.

**Scrutiny Process**

The council has an active Scrutiny Committee, consisting of 13 councillors, that considers policy development issues, monitors performance and reviews decisions made by the executive. It meets every five to six weeks on average.

During 2012 the committee met 11 times and considered 27 reports.

The council also has a Governance Committee, consisting of 6 councillors, which meets four or five times per year. The committee audits the council’s financial processes and monitors and make recommendations on the council’s wider governance arrangements.

During 2012 the committee met 6 times and considered 32 reports.
The scrutiny process appears to work effectively and efficiently and has received positive comments from external auditors. The impact of a change in councillor numbers from 55 to 50 is sustainable.

**Governance arrangements generally**

All of the above illustrates that from a political and managerial viewpoint the Council currently has an efficient and effective governance regime which has been the subject of positive external audit comments.

The main thrust of this regime comes through the effective interaction of Executive Cabinet with a robust scrutiny challenge coming from the Scrutiny and Governance Committees coupled with the regular work of the Planning and Licensing Committees.

The Council believes that, given that three members of the Council do not sit on any committee, a reduction from 55 to 50 is sustainable.

**Representative role of councillors**

South Ribble Borough is a relatively medium size borough with a mix of urban and rural areas. Some wards cover quite large rural areas and the borough is partly parished. The average electorate currently per councillor is 1,571.

Historically, the Council has nominated councillors to sit on a variety of outside bodies. The expectation is that the Council will continue to nominate to outside bodies. However, these nominations are reviewed annually and the more recent trend is for them to reduce in numbers.

The Council is aware of the Localism agenda and has been addressing it through its “My Neighbourhoods”.

The Council operated Area Committees until September 2011 but as a response to the localism agenda now operates a form of area forums known as My Neighbourhood Forums.

My Neighbourhood Forums hold scheduled meetings four times a year in the areas they represent. In addition they meet informally to deal with local issues.

Members of the public can get more closely involved in helping to shape decisions that affect their area by coming along to the local forum and speaking to councillors and other partners.

Forums are an hour long, from 7pm to 8pm, and are very informal. The Councillors representing the area attend as do police, fire, and other organisations. Decisions are not made at the forums, but feedback from residents is used to identify local priorities and direct resources.

Each forum has a Neighbourhood Plan which has been produced directly from consultation with residents. Forums have 'Core funding' to support the delivery of these plans, and local councillors decide how to spend this. They also have an influencing role in the allocation of larger sums of money, such as fees paid by developers to support local improvements.
There are five My Neighbourhood Areas:

Penwortham

Western Parishes

Eastern

Central

Leyland

The introduction of the My Neighbourhood Areas has directly increased the Councillor’s community leadership role.

The representative process appears to work effectively and efficiently and the impact of a change in councillor numbers from 55 to 50 is sustainable.

The average electorate per councillor would increase from 1,571 to 1,728 based on the current electorate.

Justification for a new Council comprising 50 councillors

When the Council was informed that an electoral review of the council was required it had no preconceived view of the number of Councillors that were required for the authority.

Since then we have looked more closely at the Council’s governance arrangements in order to determine a proposal that, as far as possible, enables the Council to continue to operate in an efficient and effective manner.

As can be seen from the above, each area of its governance arrangements has been examined in detail and the conclusion is that a substantial variation from the current figure cannot be justified either for an increase or a reduction.

In particular a substantial reduction along with the consequential democratic deficit would put in jeopardy the good community leadership work currently being undertaken in the My Neighbourhood Areas.

However, looking at the total number of seats on main bodies that make up the Council’s governance arrangements: Cabinet (6), Planning Committee (15), Licencing Committees (11), Scrutiny Committee (13) and Governance Committee (6) equals 51, the Council has concluded that a Councillor size of 50 would enable it to continue with the same executive arrangements, provide enough councillors to fulfil its regulatory and scrutiny roles and maintain its effective representative role within the My Neighbourhood areas.

As indicated above the Council moved from a Committee system to a Leader and Cabinet model prior to 2000 in anticipation of the introduction of the 2000 Act. Following consultation in 2010 it reconsidered its executive arrangements and moved to a Leader and Cabinet Executive model which was adopted in November 2010 for implementation following the Council's elections in May 2011.
However it is mindful that a future Council may wish to reconsider its governance arrangements and a reduction below 50, it is believed, would make a return to a committee system difficult.

**Warding Arrangements**

**Background**

The proposals in this submission are based on a projected electorate that would be in place by 2019. It takes into account new developments that are proposed within the Site Allocations DPD and likely to be developed by 2019. These figures previously submitted to the Boundary Commission give an elector / councillor ratio of 1877 based on the agreed proposal of councillor numbers of 50. However, these electorate estimates are a cautious figure as it is likely that some of the major development sites proposed could be brought forward following confirmation of the proposed Preston & Lancashire City Deal.

Boundary Committee unanimously concluded that the starting point for the Ward review should be to maintain, in as far as it was possible, the footprint of the My Neighbourhood areas, given the amount of work that had gone into the development of community leadership and community working in those areas and that these My Neighbourhood Areas were chosen because of their long standing community identities. The Council has also aligned some service delivery based on these areas e.g. Street Scene Services.

Using the My Neighbourhood areas as the base, the ratio of elector / councillor of 1877 equates to a representation for each of the My Neighbourhood areas of Western Parishes 7 councillors, Penwortham 10 councillors, Central 7 councillors, Eastern 12 councillors, and Leyland 14 councillors.

Consequently the Council’s proposed warding arrangement, set out below, is based on the My Neighbourhood footprint.

A map of the My Neighbourhood areas is set out below.
The Council was also mindful of the need to reflect existing communities and on the advice of the Commission that the warding arrangements could be based on one, two, or three member wards depending on what best suited the communities they served. Consequently the Council is proposing a warding pattern predominantly of two member wards (19 wards) but with three, three member wards and three, single member wards.

**Electoral fairness**

Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our proposals provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we worked out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (86,373 in 2013 and 93,856 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 50 under our proposals. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our proposals is 1,727 in 2013 and 1,877 by 2019.

Under our proposals, 24 of the 25 proposed wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the borough by 2019. The exception being Buckshaw Ward for which we make a special case. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for South Ribble.

**Proposed New Wards**

The following are narrative descriptions of our proposed warding arrangements and for greater detail, please refer to the accompanying maps and spread sheet which details the makeup of each ward.

**Western Parishes**

The electorate of Western Parishes My Neighbourhood Area required a total representation of 7 councillors.

The area is made up of four Parishes; Longton, Hutton, Much Hoole, and Little Hoole.

The proposed new warding arrangements are for a three member ward and two, two member wards

**New Longton, Hutton East and Whitestake Ward**

Under this proposal the existing wards would remain largely as they are currently, but for an area presently in Farington West known as Whitestake being moved into New Longton and Hutton east. This combines the two parts of Whitestake and so goes more logically into the Western Parishes area. In addition this change takes the boundary of the ward to the A582 in the east (currently a major road which is scheduled to become a dual carriageway) and to the railway line in the south east. In view of this change it is proposed to name this ward New Longton, Hutton East and Whitestake.
Longton and Hutton West Ward

Longton and Hutton West has changed slightly to adjust some areas whose communities look more towards Longton than New Longton.

Little and Much Hoole Ward

Little Hoole and Much Hoole are two separate villages and combined make a good two member ward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Longton, Hutton East and Whitestake</td>
<td>3899</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longton and Hutton West</td>
<td>5267</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minus 6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little and Much Hoole</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Penwortham

The electorate of Penwortham My Neighbourhood Area required a total representation of 10 councillors.

The area is made up of one Town Council Penwortham and the Penwortham My Neighbourhood Area is coterminous with the Town Council.

The proposed new warding arrangements are for a three member ward, a single member ward and three two member wards based on the community identities within Penwortham.

Howick, Priory and Whitefield Ward

Howick, Priory and Whitefield is proposed as a three member ward consisting of the old Howick and Priory Ward plus the majority of Whitefield and is centered on Liverpool Road rather than having Liverpool Road as a dividing line between the community. This better reflects the single community on each side of Liverpool Road as one community and therefore justifies this as a three member ward.

Kingsfold Ward

Kingsfold has a strong sense of identity in its own right. Therefore as the electorate for this area matches the ideal council electorate ratio closely it was felt that this community justified a single member ward in its own right bordered as it is with Pope Lane on the north and west with its southern boundary being the boundary of Penwortham Town Council and Penwortham Way.

Charnock Ward

The proposed Charnock Ward has been devised as a separate area because of the substantial increase in electorate anticipated from new development and it is seen as important to contain this in one new ward in order to facilitate the community identity of the new community which, by 2019, is expected to expand by almost a third.
Broadoak and Middleforth Wards

The proposed Broadoak and Middleforth wards are substantially based on the existing wards as they were not far off the new target electorate figure but with some minor boundary adjustments to better reflect the lines of communication within the wards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howick, Priory and Whitefield</td>
<td>5891</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plus 4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsfold</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plus 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnock</td>
<td>3974</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadoak</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleforth</td>
<td>3846</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central

The electorate of Central My Neighbourhood Area required a total representation of 7 councillors.

Central My Neighbourhood Area is made up of the parish of Farington and the community of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate.

The proposed new warding arrangements are for a three member ward and two, two member wards.

The majority of both Farington East and West Wards are contained within the Farington Parish boundary. It is proposed that both wards be amended slightly to better reflect the communities of these areas.

Farington West Ward

As mentioned previously and for the reasons stated, the western boundary of the proposed Farington West ward will be the A582 in the west (currently a major road which is scheduled to become a dual carriageway) and to the railway line in the south west. The northern boundary is made up of the Penwortham Town Council and the Farington Parish boundary. The eastern boundary of the ward is the existing Farington Parish boundary until it reaches the West Coast Mainline railway which then forms the division between the east and west wards. The southern boundary is formed by the southern boundary of the Farington Parish.

Farington East Ward

The northern boundary of the proposed Farington East ward is the northern boundary of Farington Parish which separates it from the Lostock Hall and Bamber Bridge unparished areas. The western boundary follows the West Coast Mainline railway. However, the new development proposed to the south of the Farington East ward would, if the railway line was used exclusively as the boundary, push the electorate figure for Farington West above the desired range. Plus, the new development will have greater community connections.
with the east ward as there will be no direct road access into Farington West. This area has therefore been included in the Farington East Ward.

The southern boundary is formed by the southern boundary of the Farington Parish. However, the boundary has previously followed a water course and we are proposing to undertake a Community Governance Review, we have adjusted this boundary to follow stronger existing geographical features.

The Farington East ward is the remainder of the Farington Parish up to the eastern boundary of Farington. For completeness, it is proposed that the ward boundary on the east side is taken up to the M6 motorway as this is the logical boundary and therefore would take in a small unparished area into Farington East ward. It is also proposed that a small number of houses which are within the community of Farington should be moved from the old St Ambrose Ward into the proposed Farington East Ward and subsequently into the Farington Parish Council.

Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate

The remaining part of Central is the unparished area of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate. Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate are communities in their own right bordered in the east by the dual carriageway of the A6, on the west by the boundaries of Farington Parish and Penwortham Town Council and the partially duelled A582 and Farington Parish boundary in the south.

Most of the proposed northern boundary follows the existing Tardy Gate ward along the route of the” Old Tram Road” with a section in the north west excluded and moved into the proposed Walton-le-Dale East ward. This area of major new development will be fed entirely by the new partially completed cross borough link road which will connect the whole of this development area directly to Walton Park. There will be no direct vehicular access from the current Tardy Gate ward

The electorate figure for this area is 5975 which makes this an ideal match for a three member ward. As this reflects the communities it would be difficult and unnecessary to divide it into a two and one member ward. The old warding arrangements divided the community between north and south of Brownedge Road and this has always been thought unhelpful in the development of the communities of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate.

It should be noted at this stage that the amendments to the Farington Wards to reflect the Whitestake area, and the area to the south and south east of the parish, will need to be addressed at some future stage by a Community Governance Review which will be commenced if the proposed warding arrangements are adopted by the Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farington East</td>
<td>3778</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farington West</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate</td>
<td>5975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plus 6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eastern

The electorate of Eastern My Neighbourhood Area required a total representation of 12 councillors.

The Eastern area is made up of the parish of Samlesbury and Cuerdale and the communities of Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale and the smaller communities of Coupe Green, Gregson Lane, Hoghton and Higher Walton.

The proposed new warding arrangements are for six, two member wards.

Samlesbury and Walton Ward

The proposed ward of Samlesbury and Walton which consists of the parish of Samlesbury and Cuerdale and the communities of Higher Walton, has the distinct boundaries of Preston City Council to the North, Ribble Valley to the North East and Chorley to the South East. It stretches to the south west to the River Darwen taking in the community of Higher Walton. This makes this ward difficult to alter to any logical extent.

The electorate figure percentage for this area at 91.9% is on the low side but given the size of the area and the rural nature of the ward it is felt this is a ward that does not require amending.

Walton-le-Dale West Ward

The unparished area of Walton-le-Dale is bounded to the north by Preston City Council, to the west by Penwortham Town Council and to the north east by the River Darwen and by Chorley Road (B6258) which are strong boundaries.

The new ward has been extended in the south west over the tramway to incorporate the area of major new development. This has been done as these developments are separate to the communities of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate and will be linked to Walton-le-Dale West once the new partially completed cross borough link road is completed. This area of major new development will be fed entirely by the new partially completed cross borough link road which will connect the whole of this development area directly to Walton Park with no direct vehicular access from the current Tardy Gate ward or the proposed Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate ward.

Walton-le-Dale East Ward

The area to the north of the two Bamber Bridge Wards is the eastern part of the Walton-le-Dale community. The new ward has been extended to the south to include the northern part of Bamber Bridge. This has been undertaken to ensure the two Bamber Bridge Wards and the Walton-le-Dale East Ward meets the elector/councillor ratio. It uses as its boundary the Walton-le-Dale West ward to the west, the River Darwen to the North and the M6 Motorway to the East.

Coupe Green, Gregson Lane and Hospital Inn Ward

The existing ward of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane consists of the two separate communities of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane. However, the electorate figures of the existing ward are too low and as a result the ward needs expanding. Given the limitation of
the Chorley Borough Council boundary to the west and the Samlesbury and Walton ward to the north and east the only logical expansion is to the south west over the M61 into an area of existing and new development. Although this expansion over the M61 would seem unusual the area it takes is in itself bounded by the M61 and M6 motorway and the East Lancs railway line and as such is difficult to link with any area.

**Bamber Bridge East**

The remaining area of the Eastern My Neighbourhood area is that of the Bamber Bridge Town centre and surrounding community. This area has been divided into two, two member wards using the main road (Station Road) as the logical division between the east ward and the west ward. The proposed east ward extends eastward as far as the M61 and to the Chorley Borough Council boundary in the south. It extends northwards as far as School Lane.

**Bamber Bridge West**

The west ward uses Station Road as its eastern boundary with Farington Parish forming the southern boundary and the dual carriageway of the A6 the western boundary. Both the wards then extend northwards to the extent necessary to reach the desired electorate figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samlesbury and Walton</td>
<td>3452</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton-le-Dale West</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton-le-Dale East</td>
<td>3712</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupe Green, Gregson Lane and Hospital Inn</td>
<td>3813</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamber Bridge East</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamber Bridge West</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leyland**

The electorate of Leyland My Neighbourhood Area required a total representation of 14 councillors.

The proposed new warding arrangements are for six, two member wards and two single member wards.

One of the My Neighbourhood Areas consists of the township of Leyland which has been a community for a considerable period of time. Within Leyland are a number of smaller communities which includes Moss Side, Midge Hall, Earnshaw Bridge, Sevens Stars, Broadfield and the areas around St Andrews and St Ambrose churches. There are also new communities forming due to large areas of new housing development, the main one being Buckshaw Village. Where possible the warding pattern has tried to reflect these communities whilst at the same time keeping within the elector/councillor ratio.
**Buckshaw Ward**

The current ward of Leyland St Ambrose included part of former industrial site within its area. This area has now been developed as a new community comprising over 1000 properties. Although it is within the Leyland wards it is distinctly separate from Leyland by the M6 motorway, the A49 and the West Coast Mainline railway. Buckshaw Village has been developed as a separate sustainable new settlement with shops, a school, a community centre, a railway station on the Preston to Manchester line and other community facilities. It also straddles the Local Government boundaries of South Ribble Borough Council and Chorley Borough Council.

Buckshaw’s unique features and its developing community identity separate from both Leyland and Chorley centres, with a very active village residents group, justify a different treatment in this review.

The projected electorate of the South Ribble part of Buckshaw, based on the existing electorate of 1206 and the new development, is expected to be 1664 by 2019. This would give an electorate percentage for a single member ward of 88.6% which is just outside the tolerance figure of plus or minus 10%. However, the current average occupancy rate for the borough is 1.8 per property. In Buckshaw the current occupancy rate is 1.2 per property.

Buckshaw has a large number of rented accommodation units with a high turnover of occupants which may account for the low electoral registration rate.

We believe that, although below the threshold at this stage this is an incorrect reflection of the potential electorate for this area and together with its separate identity should make this an exceptional ward.

**St Andrews Ward**

To the east of this proposed ward is the Buckshaw’s ward boundary, the M6 motorway and the West Coast Mainline railway and to the south is the boundary with Chorley Borough Council. The area comprises Worden Park and the Worden Park estate. The main part of the ward was previously Leyland St Mary’s Ward but by expanding the ward further north to increase the electorate it makes the central point St Andrew’s Church and thereby justifies the new name of St Andrews Ward.

**Lowerhouse and Seven Stars Ward**

This new ward includes a substantial part of the original ward of Lowerhouse and includes all of the community of Seven Stars which had previously been split across two wards. It is bordered on the South by Shaw Brook which is the boundary between the present St Mary's ward and Chorley Borough Council. The western boundary follows Schleswig Way, Slater Lane and Leyland Lane. The northern boundary has been extended to increase the electorate.

**Riverside/Lostock Ward**

The boundary to the south, the east and the west of the ward is the boundary with Chorley Borough Council. The proposed Riverside/Lostock Ward takes in the eastern part of the community of Moss Side and follows the River Lostock to the southern boundary. A large proposed development is included to the east of the ward.
Moss Side and Midge Hall Ward

This proposed ward is bordered by the parishes of Much Hoole and Little Hoole to the west, the parishes of Longton and Farington to the north and Chorley Borough Council to the south. It is proposed that the ward boundary to the east will follow the B5253 – Schleswig Way. The ward would include a substantial part of the community of Moss Side and a substantial area of new development.

Earnshaw Bridge Ward

The proposed ward’s northern boundary is the boundary of Farington Parish Council. It is proposed that the western boundary is the B5253 – Schleswig Way and will therefore include the community of Earnshaw Bridge. The ward will also include the industrial area to the north of Golden Hill Lane, the residential area off Hall Lane and the new residential development accessed from Egerton Road and Cleveland Road.

St Ambrose Ward

This proposed ward is bordered on the east by Chorley Borough Council and the proposed Buckshaw ward with the boundary following the M6 Motorway. The northern boundary is the boundary of Farington Parish Council and it is proposed that a small number of houses which are within the community of Farington should be moved from the former St Ambrose Ward into the proposed Farington East Ward and subsequently into the Farington Parish Council. The rest of the ward boundary has been devised to meet the required elector/councillor ratio.

Broadfield Ward

This proposed ward also has Farington Parish Council as part of its northern boundary along with Golden Hill Lane which is the proposed Earnshaw Bridge boundary. It is bordered to the south west by Broadfield Drive and by the proposed wards of St Andrews and St Ambrose to the south and east respectively. The ward is substantially made up of the community of Broadfield, Leyland Town Centre and the newly developing community off Wheelton Lane.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckshaw</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minus 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>3716</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowerhouse and Seven Stars</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside/Lostock</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Side &amp; Midge Hall</td>
<td>3771</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnshaw Bridge</td>
<td>1717</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minus 8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ambrose</td>
<td>3627</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadfield</td>
<td>4007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Table 1 shows the current position on electoral equality, based on 2012 electorate figures and what it projected to be based on 2019 electorate figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements: Existing</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>1702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the impact of our proposals on electoral equality, based on 2019 electorate figures and what it projected to be based on 2019 electorate figures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Summary of electoral arrangements: Proposals</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 2.00 p.m. on Wednesday, 27th November, 2012 in Cross Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH

Present:-

Councillor Mrs M Smith (in the chair)

Councillors M Gardner, Hamman, Harrison, Heyworth, Hughes, Martin, Mullineaux, P Smith, and Watts,

In Attendance:-

Democratic Services Manager (Martin O’Loughlin) Democratic Services Officer (James Wallwork)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Appointment of Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLVED (Unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That Councillor Mrs Smith be appointed Chairman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no apologies for absence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was agreed to note the Committees Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boundary Commission Provisional Timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was agreed to note the Boundary Commission provisional timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Council Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chairman introduced this item which was to consider the Council’s response to the Boundary Commission’s request for a draft submission on council size by 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX A
December 2012 and final submission by 11 January 2013.

The Chairman also referred to the copy of the Local Government Boundary Commission's guidance “Council size: Helping you make the strongest possible case to the Commission” which had been circulated to the Committee.

Members of the committee discussed the issues contained in the Guidance and concluded that a substantial variation from the existing Council size was not desirable.

During further discussions the chairman suggested a figure of 50 which was debated against the existing number of 55.

Following further discussions the committee agreed that although some members had been assuming no change from the existing figure of 55, a reduction to 50 was acceptable.

RESOLVED (Unanimous)

1. That the Council's submission to the Boundary Commission be for Council size of 50 members.

2. That the officers in consultation with the members of the Boundary Committee prepare, for approval by Council, a submission to the Boundary Commission for a Council size of 50 members.

7 Future Meetings

It was agreed that, as it had been resolved that the recommended Council's submission to the Boundary Commission be for Council size of 50 members, the meeting provisionally scheduled for 2.00 p.m. Tuesday 4 December 2012 be cancelled.

The meeting closed at 2.55pm.

........................................................................................................ Chairman
Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 4.00 p.m. on Tuesday, 18th June, 2013 in the Cross Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH

Present:-
Councillor Mrs M Smith (in the chair)
Councillors M Gardner, Hughes, Martin, Mullineaux, Pimblett and P Smith,

In Attendance:-
Democratic Services Manager (Martin O'Loughlin) Democratic Services Officer (James Wallwork)

Public Attendance:-
Nil

Other Members and Officers:-
Councillor M Tomlinson, Mike Nuttall, Maureen Wood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hamman and Heyworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minutes of the Last Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLVED (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 27th November, 2012 be signed as a correct record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review Timetable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Mrs Smith introduced this item and explained the need for several meetings prior the Council meeting on the 24 July at which a decision on the submission to the Boundary Commission would have to be made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The timetable was noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>To Consider any Proposals for Revised Ward Boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Councillor Mrs Smith introduced this item and referred to work that had gone on in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collating and submitting to the Boundary Commission the current and projected electorate figures for now and to 2019 and that gave an elector / councillor ratio of 1876 based on the agreed councillor numbers of 50.

She went on further to say that her group had concluded that the starting point for the Ward review should be to maintain, in as far as it was possible, the footprint of the My Neighbourhood areas, given the amount of work that had gone into the development of community working in those areas.

Based on that premise the representation for each of the areas would be Eastern 11.31 Councillors, Penwortham 10.39, Central 7.51, Western Parishes 6.66 and Leyland 13.97.

Councillor Mrs Smith also referred to their desire, again where possible, to maintain the integrity of the Parish and Town Council boundaries.

Councillor Tomlinson informed the Committee that his group had not started with the existing My Neighbourhood areas but they had concluded that the Leyland area would need to lose two councillors taking it to 14 which equated to the 13.97 previously identified.

He also agreed that he could see the logic of basing the review on the My Neighbourhood Areas and that proposals based on the electorate figures for the areas of Western Parishes, Penwortham, and Leyland of 7, 10, and 14 Councillors respectively had some merit but he was more minded to see Eastern with 11 and Central with 8 rather than 12 and 7 as had been suggested.

It was generally agreed that the main area of debate would be around the boundaries of Central and Eastern and the detail of the ward lines within all the areas.

Councillor Pimblett asked whether all proposed development had been taken into account in the projected electorate and he was assured that it had. He also questioned whether the proposed Councillor numbers of 50 was still subject to debate. He was reminded that this had been unanimously supported by this Committee and Council and subsequently ratified by the Boundary Commission following extensive consultation.

It was agreed, that in order to meet the timetable it was imperative for firm proposals to be debated at the next meeting to be held on 1 July.

It was therefore agreed that each group would bring proposals (that is lines on maps) to the next meeting.

### Forthcoming Meetings

Members noted that meetings had been arranged for Monday 1 July 2013, Monday 8 July 2013, Tuesday 22 October 2013 and Monday 4 November 2013 and following a request from Councillor Martin it was agreed that the meetings would commence at 4.15pm

The meeting closed at 4.38pm.

.............................................................. Chairman
SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 4.15pm on Monday 1 July 2013 in the President’s Suite, Lancashire Football Association HQ, Thurston Road, Leyland PR25 2LF

Present:-
Councillor Mrs M Smith (in the chair)
Councillors M Gardner, Hamman, Harrison, Hughes, Martin, Mullineaux, Pimblett and P Smith,

In Attendance:-
Democratic Services Manager (Martin O’Loughlin) and Senior Democratic Services Officer (Andy Houlker)

Public Attendance:- 0

Other Members and Officers:- Councillors Michael Green, Howarth and M Tomlinson and Mike Nuttall and Maureen Wood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Heyworth and Watts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minutes of the Last Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLVED (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 18 June 2013 be signed as a correct record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>To Consider Proposals for Revised Ward Boundaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|            | Councillor Mrs M Smith introduced the item and opened the debate. Then followed a discussion on the alternative warding proposals by each group based around the five My Neighbourhood areas (Central, Eastern, Leyland, Penwortham and Western Parishes).

It appeared from the discussion that there was general agreement with the proposed warding arrangements for the Western Parishes. It was felt the proposed arrangements for Penwortham had some similarities and those for Leyland and the Central area were not vastly different but would need further consideration. Unfortunately Councillor Watts who had worked on warding proposals for Eastern had been unable to attend the meeting. It was suggested that Councillor Watts should provide his proposals by Thursday/Friday and possibly meet Councillor Mullineaux to discuss respective proposals for Eastern before the next committee meeting on 8 July 2013. |
The consensus was that it was hoped that there would be some more agreement (probably not 100%) on the warding proposals at the meeting on 8 July. Following which a report of the Boundary Committee would be presented to the meeting of the Council on Wednesday 24 July 2013.

It was therefore agreed:

1. that there was general agreement with the proposed warding arrangements for the Western Parishes;

2. that the Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat groups give further consideration to each other’s proposals and each be provided with a copy of the associated proposals and maps; and

3. that hopefully before the next meeting on Monday 8 July, Councillors Mullineaux and Watts would have met to discuss their group’s respective proposals for the Eastern area.

11 Forthcoming Meetings

Members noted that the next meeting was on Monday 8 July 2013 to prepare the committee’s findings for presentation to full Council.

Further meetings had been scheduled for Tuesday 22 October 2013 and Monday 4 November 2013 to consider the Boundary Commission’s draft recommendations.

................................................................. Chairman

The meeting finished at 5.13pm
SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 4.15pm on Monday 8 July 2013 in the Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland PR25 1DH

Present:-
Councillor Mrs M Smith (in the chair)

Councillors M Gardner, Hamman, Harrison, Hughes, Martin, Mullineaux, Pimblett, P Smith and Watts

In Attendance:-
Senior Democratic Services Officer (Andy Houlker) and Democratic Services Officer (James Wallwork)

Public Attendance:- 1

Other Members and Officers:- Councillors Coulton, Michael Green, Hesketh and M Tomlinson and Maureen Wood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Apology for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An apology for absence was received from Councillor Heyworth. The Chairman reminded Councillor Tomlinson that whilst he could take part in the discussions he would not be able to vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Minutes of the Last Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLVED (unanimous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 1 July 2013 be signed as a correct record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>To Finalise Recommendations for Revised Ward Boundaries for Submission to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further to min. no.10, 1 July 2013, the Chairman proposed to deal with the revised ward boundaries by each of the five neighbourhood areas in turn with an aim to identify any aspects of consensus. Whilst all members of the committee recognised the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) was more likely to accept the council’s proposals if they had cross party support, however, it was unlikely that there would be complete consensus from all three parties. There was then a general discussion on each of the five areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following on from the meeting on 1 July there was all party support for the warding arrangements in the Western Parishes as proposed by the Conservative group. In view of a change to the New Longton and Hutton East ward it was suggested the title of this ward be amended to New Longton, Hutton East and Whitestake ward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In respect of the Central area, there was then consensus on the Conservative group’s proposed warding arrangements for the two wards of Farington East and Farington West. Moving to the Central area’s remaining new ward of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate, whilst accepting this as a three member ward the Labour group suggested an alternative which moved 739 electors in to Walton-le-Dale East (in the Eastern neighbourhood area). The electorate figures for the revised wards (including those in Eastern) would apparently be within the tolerances. There was then a general discussion, but no agreement as this subsequently impacted on the electorate figures for the proposed wards in the Eastern area.

The committee then turned to the Eastern neighbourhood area. Bearing in mind the above discussion regarding the ward of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate it was agreed that it was too late in the process to come to an agreement. The Labour group then indicated that it would submit its own suggested revised ward boundaries for the ward of Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate and, those wards in the Eastern neighbourhood area.

The next area considered was the Penwortham neighbourhood area. The committee debated two proposals, firstly by the Conservative group and then a joint proposal by the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups. Whilst there was a degree of similarity, an area of major discussion was Kingsfold. Similar to above the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups indicated that they would submit a joint alternative for the revised ward boundaries for those wards in the Penwortham neighbourhood area.

The Chairman confirmed that the plans illustrating the council’s revised ward boundaries would not be available to the public before they were submitted to the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC). Following which they would form part of the LGBC’s 12 week consultation process.

In response to an enquiry regarding possible names for wards in the Leyland area, it was suggested to change the name of the ward of Leyland St Marys to Leyland St Andrews (as this was now the relevant church in the ward), Leyland St Ambrose was still appropriate and there was a proposal to amend the name of the ward of Moss Side to Moss Side and Midge Hall.

The Chairman advised the committee that it now appeared Chorley council was prepared to re-enter dialogue regarding the boroughs’ boundary anomalies at Buckshaw Village which might come forward as part of this review, if time permitted.

It was therefore agreed that as previously discussed the revised warding arrangements for the borough be grouped in the council’s five neighbourhood areas. The following proposed warding arrangements be submitted to the meeting of the council to be held on 24 July 2013:

1. that the revised warding arrangements for the Western Parishes neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (unanimous);

2. that the revised warding arrangements for the two wards of Farington East and Farington West in the Central neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (unanimous);

3. i) that the revised warding arrangements for the ward of Lostock Hall and Tardygate in the Central neighbourhood area and those wards in the Eastern
neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (6 for, 3 against, 1 abstention); and

ii) that the Labour group reserved its right to submit its own proposals, relating to the ward of Locket Hall and Tardygate in the Central neighbourhood area and those wards in the Eastern neighbourhood area, to the Local Government Boundary Commission;

4. i) that the revised warding arrangements for the Penwortham neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (6 for, 4 against); and

ii) that the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups reserved their right to submit a joint alternative proposal for Penwortham neighbourhood area to the Local Government Boundary Commission;

5. that the revised warding arrangements for the Leyland neighbourhood area ward of Moss Side as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (unanimous);

6. i) that the remaining revised warding arrangements for Leyland neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (6 for, 4 against); and

ii) that the Labour group reserved its right to submit its own proposals, for the remaining wards in the Leyland neighbourhood area, to the Local Government Boundary Commission.

16 Forthcoming Meetings
Members noted the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC) Timetable. This included the council having to submit its proposed revised ward boundaries to the LGBC by 5 August 2013. Hence the need for Council to approve the Boundary Committee report from this meeting at its meeting on the 24 July 2013.

Following which the LGBC would meet on 10 September 2013. The LGBC would then open a period of consultation on the draft recommendations from 15 October 2013 to 6 January 2014 (12 weeks). To consider this, further meetings of the council’s Boundary Committee had been scheduled for Tuesday 22 October 2013 and Monday 4 November 2013.

................................................................. Chairman

The meeting finished at 5.16pm
**Report of the Boundary Committee**

The Leader commended the report of the Boundary Committee meeting held on 27 November 2012. The report was seconded. The Leader said she would find out more about how the Boundary Commission wanted the council to proceed at a meeting with Boundary Commission representatives in early February.

RESOLVED (unanimous):

That the report ‘Electoral Review of South Ribble Council Proposals in Relation to Council Size’ contained at Appendix 1 to the report be approved as the submission to the Boundary Commission.
Report of the Boundary Committee

The Leader presented the report of the meeting held on 8 July and extended her thanks to the members and officers who had been involved in the Boundary Review so far. The report was seconded.

Councillor M Tomlinson echoed the Leader’s comments and made special mention of the extensive work by James Wallwork from Democratic Services in producing numerous maps. He said it had been inevitable that at this stage the groups would have to agree to disagree on some of the areas but he noted that there was no specific mention in the recommendation of the consensus to work along My Neighbourhood area boundaries. The Leader confirmed that this was certainly the intention as far as was possible.

RESOLVED that:
1. the revised warding arrangements for Western Parishes neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (unanimous);
2. the revised warding arrangements for the two wards of Farington East and Farington West in the Central neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (27 YES, 18 NO, 0 ABSTENTION);
3. i) the revised warding arrangements for the ward of Lostock Hall and Tardygate in the Central neighbourhood area and those wards in the Eastern neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (23 YES, 19 NO, 3 ABSTENTION); ii) the Labour Group reserve its right to submit its own proposals, relating to the ward of Lostock Hall and Tardygate in the Central neighbourhood area and those wards in the Eastern neighbourhood area, to the Local Government Boundary Commission;
4. i) the revised warding arrangements for the Penwortham neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (26 YES, 19 NO, 0 ABSTENTION); ii) the Labour and Liberal Democrat groups reserve their right to submit a joint alternative proposal for Penwortham neighbourhood area to the Local Government Boundary Commission;
5. the revised warding arrangements for the Leyland neighbourhood area ward of Moss Side as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (unanimous);
6. i) the remaining revised warding arrangements for Leyland neighbourhood area as proposed by the Conservative Group be the Council’s submission to the Local Government Boundary Commission (26 YES, 19 NO, 0 ABSTENTION); ii) the Labour Group reserve its right to submit its own proposals for the remaining wards in the Leyland neighbourhood area to the Local Government Boundary Commission; and
7. the Chief Executive in consultation with the chairman of the Boundary Committee be authorised to finalise the Council’s submission for revised ward boundaries to the Local Government Boundary Commission by 5 August 2013 (27 YES, 18 NO, 0 ABSTENTION).
MEMBERSHIP OF CABINET 2012/13

CABINET (6)

Councillors Hamman, Hughes, Mullineaux, S M Robinson, Mrs M R Smith and P Smith

*Responsibilities*

Leader of the Council – Councillor Mrs M R Smith
Deputy Leader and Neighbourhoods and Street Scene – Councillor Mullineaux
Finance and Resources – Councillor S M Robinson
Regeneration, Leisure and Healthy Communities – Councillor P Smith
Shared Services and Corporate Support – Councillor Hamman
Strategic Planning and Housing – Councillor Hughes

Chairman: Councillor Mrs M R Smith
Vice-chairman: Councillor Mullineaux
SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES 2012/13 NOMINATIONS

1. SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (13)

   (a) Conservative (8)

   Councillors W Bennett, Coulton, M Gardner, McNulty, Nelson, Otter, Miss Walker and Mrs Woollard

   (b) Labour (5)

   Councillors S Bennett, Forrest, Mrs Jones, Martin and Titherington

   Chairman:   Councillor Titherington
   Vice-chairman:  Councillor Nelson

2. PLANNING COMMITTEE (15)

   (a) Conservative (9)

   Councillors Mrs D Gardner, Mrs M Green, Hesketh, Marsh, Mrs Moon, Mrs Noblet, Stettner, Walton and Yates

   (b) Labour (6)

   Councillors Crook, Evans, Foster, Ms Prynn, M Tomlinson, and Watts

   Chairman:   Councillor Hesketh
   Vice-chairman:  Councillor Yates

3. LICENSING ACT COMMITTEE (11)

   (a) Conservative (6)

   Councillors Mrs Ball, Mrs Beattie, Mrs Hothersall, Rainsbury, Mrs M Robinson and Suthers

   (b) Labour (4)

   Councillors Bell, Bradley, Kelly, and C Tomlinson

   (c) Liberal Democrat (1)

   Councillor Pimblett

   Chairman:   Councillor Rainsbury
   Vice-chairman:  Councillor Mrs M Robinson
4. GENERAL LICENSING COMMITTEE (10)

(a) Conservative (6)

Councillors Mrs Ball, Mrs Beattie, Mrs Hothersall, Rainsbury, Mrs M Robinson and Suthers

(b) Labour (4)

Councillor Bell, Bradley, Kelly, and C Tomlinson

Chairman: Councillor Rainsbury
Vice-chairman: Councillor Mrs M Robinson

5. GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE (6)

(a) Conservative (4)

Councillors W Bennett, Michael Green, Mrs Mort and O’Hare

(b) Labour (2)

Councillor Foster and Patten

Chairman: Councillor O’Hare
Vice-chairman: Councillor Foster

6. APPEALS COMMITTEE (6)

(a) Conservative (4)

Councillors Clark, Mrs Noblet, Stettner and Walton

(b) Labour (2)

Councillor Titherington and Heyworth

7. STANDARDS COMMITTEE (7)

From the commencement date of the new regulations:

(a) Conservative (4)

Councillors Michael Green, Mrs Mort, Otter and Miss Walker

(b) Labour (3)

Councillors Harrison, Heyworth and Mrs Jones

Chairman: To be appointed by the Standards Committee at its first meeting
Vice-chairman: To be appointed by the Standards Committee at its first meeting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outside Body</strong></th>
<th><strong>Representative(s)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Local Government Association – General Assembly</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local Government Association – Rural Commission</td>
<td>Councillor J Hesketh, Director of Planning and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local Government Association – Urban Commission</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Housing, Director of Planning and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Runshaw College Community Liaison Committee</td>
<td>Councillors P Hamman, Mrs C Moon, M P France, M McNulty, Mrs S Jones and W Evans, The Chief Executive (or his representative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Springfields Fuels Limited Site Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>Councillor M Gardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. North Western Local Authorities’ Employers’ Organisation</td>
<td>Leader, Substitute: Deputy Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Chorley, South Ribble and Districts Citizens’ Advice Bureaux – Management Committee</td>
<td>Councillor J W M Otter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Orvia Previously Business Venture Group</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Trustees of Alice Rowlinson’s Charity</td>
<td>Councillors Michael A Green and C Tomlinson, Mr C Marsden and Mrs Titherington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Trustees of Shutlingfield Charity, Walton-le-Dale</td>
<td>Councillors J D Marsh, P Mullineaux, W Bennett and B Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Children’s Trust</td>
<td>Councillor Mrs Noblet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Preston’s Guild Committee</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chorley &amp; South Ribble Health &amp; Wellbeing Partnership</td>
<td>Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Leisure and Healthy Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Balshaws Church of England Controlled High Educational Foundation</td>
<td>Councillor P Hamman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Higher Walton Community Centre Management Committee</td>
<td>Councillor B Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. New Progress Housing Association Board of Management</td>
<td>Councillor B Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Organisation/Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leyland and District Nursing Association Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ribble Estuary Strategy Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Lancashire Waste Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>North West Housing Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Penwortham Community Centre Joint Management Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lancashire Health Scrutiny Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust – Governing Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>South Ribble Leisure Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Local Authority Elected Member Older People’s Champions’ Network: North West of England (Older People’s Champion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Chorley &amp; South Ribble Disability Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Ribble Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Leyland Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Local Strategic (South Ribble) Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Safer South Ribble &amp; Chorley Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Joint Planning Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Financial and Assurance Shared Services Joint Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitutes: Deputy Leader Cabinet Member for Strategic Planning and Housing, Cabinet Member for Regeneration, Leisure and Healthy Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>