

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No. 52

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REPORT NO. 52

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Edmund Compton, GCB, KBE.

DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

Mr J M Rankin, QC.

MEMBERS

The Countess Of Albemarle, DBE.

Mr T C Benfield.

Professor Michael Chisholm.

Sir Andrew Wheatley, CBE.

Mr F B Young, CBE.

To the Rt Hon Roy Jenkins, MP
Secretary of State for the Home Department

PROPOSALS FOR REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE CITY OF LANCASTER
IN THE COUNTY OF LANCASHIRE

1. We, the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, having carried out our initial review of the electoral arrangements for the City of Lancaster in accordance with the requirements of section 63 of, and of Schedule 9 to, the Local Government Act 1972, present our proposals for the future electoral arrangements for that City.
2. In accordance with the procedure laid down in section 60(1) and (2) of the 1972 Act, notice was given on 13 May 1974 that we were to undertake this review. This was incorporated in a consultation letter addressed to the Lancaster City Council, copies of which were circulated to the Lancashire County Council, Parish Councils and Parish Meetings in the district, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned and the headquarters of the main political parties. Copies were also sent to the editors of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Notices inserted in the local press announced the start of the review and invited comments from members of the public and from any interested bodies.
3. Lancaster City Council were invited to prepare a draft scheme of representation for our consideration. In doing so, they were asked to observe the rules laid down in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 and the guidelines which we set out in our Report No 6 about the proposed size of the council and the proposed number of councillors for each ward. They were asked also to take into account any views expressed to them following their consultation with local interests. We therefore asked that they should publish details of their provisional proposals about a month before they submitted their draft scheme to us, thus allowing an opportunity for local comment.

4. In accordance with section 7(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the Council had exercised an option for a system of whole council elections.
5. On 30 September 1974 the Lancaster City Council presented their draft scheme of representation. The Council proposed to divide the area into 39 wards each returning 1, 2 or 3 members to form a Council of 60, the same as at present.
6. Following the publication of the City Council's provisional proposals we received letters from the councils of 20 of the 38 parishes in the district objecting to the proposed scheme on the grounds that it would reduce by one the total number of councillors representing the rural wards of the City. This was to be achieved by regrouping the parishes in three of the present district wards to produce two wards - Caton and Ellel - returning a total of 4 members instead of 5 as at present. It was argued that the parish of Thurnham, with its shipping and light industrial interests, had different needs from its more agricultural neighbours and, accordingly, that it should continue to form a separate ward with the parishes of Ashton with Stodday and Cockerham.
7. We received comments also from a local political party objecting to the City Council's proposal to form a separate ward for the area of the University of Lancaster and to the proposed wards in the Morecambe and Heysham area of the City. Alternative arrangements for these areas were suggested.
8. The City Council sent us copies of the correspondence received by them both before and after the publication of their provisional proposals. In some instances they had been able to ^{agree} agree the suggestions put forward and incorporate them in their draft scheme. The remaining correspondence dealt with the same issues as those raised in the letters we had received.
9. We considered the draft scheme together with the comments which had been made upon it.

10. We studied the complaints which had been made about the representation of the rural areas. We found that the total number of seats which the Council proposed to allocate to the rural areas was precisely in accordance with their share of the total electorate of the City. Moreover, in spite of the constraints imposed by the requirement to respect parish boundaries in forming the rural wards, the councillor/elector ratios would not deviate too far from the average for the City as a whole. Accordingly, we decided to propose no changes in the rural parts of the City.

11. In the Morecambe and Heysham area of the City we found that the warding arrangements proposed by the City Council would produce a rather uneven standard of representation. The alternative proposals for this area, which had been submitted by a local political party, appeared to us to offer an improved standard of representation and we decided to adopt them. In doing so we noted that the boundaries of the proposed Heysham North ward had an appendage extending eastwards and we resolved to investigate at a later stage whether the area in question might conveniently be included in the proposed Harbour ward.

12. On the evidence available to us, we concluded that for local electoral purposes the University was best integrated into the town and we decided therefore to adopt the proposals submitted by the local political party which involved the inclusion of the proposed University ward in the proposed Scotforth East ward and an adjustment of the boundary between the latter ward and the proposed Scotforth West ward in order to produce two balanced wards each returning 3 councillors.

13. On the recommendation of Ordnance Survey we made some minor adjustments to the alignment of some of the boundaries in order to secure boundary lines which were more readily identifiable on the ground.

14. Subject to the changes referred to in paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 above, we decided that the City Council's draft scheme provided a reasonable basis for the future electoral arrangements of the City in compliance with the rules in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act and our guidelines and we formulated our draft proposals accordingly.

15. On 22 November 1974 we issued our draft proposals and these were sent to all who had received our consultation letter or had commented on the Council's draft scheme. The Council were asked to make these draft proposals and the accompanying maps, which defined the proposed ward boundaries, available for inspection at their main offices. Representations on our draft proposals were invited from those to whom they were circulated and, by public notices, from other members of the public and interested bodies. We asked that any comments should reach us by 17 January 1975.

16. A parish council and a number of local political parties wrote to us in support of our draft proposals.

17. The Lancaster City Council reaffirmed the proposals comprised in their draft scheme for the Morecambe & Heysham area of the City and for a separate ward covering the University of Lancaster. They also questioned the suitability of the name of our proposed Heaton with Oxcliffe ward and suggested that 'Overton' or 'Middleton' might be more appropriate. A parish council also objected to the name of this proposed ward and suggested that it be changed to "Overton". Another parish council wrote to us drawing attention to their earlier protest about the proposed reduction in the number of councillors representing the rural areas of the City. This referred to the Caton & Ellel wards where it was proposed that the total number of councillors representing the area covered by the two wards should be reduced from 5 members to 4.

18. In view of these comments, and of our wish for the boundaries of the proposed Heysham North ward to be examined, we decided that we needed further information to enable us to reach a conclusion. Therefore, in accordance with section 65(2) of the 1972 Act and at our request, you appointed Mr P P Bayley Brown as an Assistant Commissioner to hold a local meeting and report to us.

19. The Assistant Commissioner held a meeting at the Town Hall, Lancaster on 11 June 1975. A copy (without enclosures) of his report to us of the meeting is attached at Schedule 1 to this report.

20. The Assistant Commissioner recommended that the proposed Heaton with Oxcliffe ward should be named Overton Ward and that the Council's proposals for a 3-member Scotforth East Ward, a 2-member Scotforth West Ward and a 1-member University Ward be adopted in substitution for our draft proposals for this part of the district. The latter recommendation was subject to a minor boundary adjustment at Bailrigg Lane recommended (at an earlier stage) by the Ordnance Survey in the interest of clear boundaries. The Assistant Commissioner recommended also that our proposals for Caton and Ellel Wards be confirmed, that our proposals for wards in the Morecambe and Heysham area be confirmed without alteration and that there should be no change in the proposed Heysham North Ward.

21. We considered again our draft proposals in the light of the comments which we had received and of the Assistant Commissioner's Report. We concluded that the alterations recommended by the Assistant Commissioner should be adopted and, subject to those amendments, we decided that our draft proposals should be confirmed as our final proposals.

22. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedule 2 to this report and on the attached maps. Schedule 2 gives the names of the wards and the number of councillors to be returned by each. The boundaries of the new wards are defined on the maps.

PUBLICATION

23. In accordance with Section 60(5)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, a copy of this report and a copy of the maps are being sent to Lancaster City Council and will be available for public inspection at the Council's main offices. Copies of this report are also being sent to those who received the consultation letter and to those who made comments. A detailed description of the boundaries of the proposed wards, as defined on the maps, is set out in Schedule 3 to this report.

L.S.

Signed

EDMUND COMPTON (CHAIRMAN)

JOHN M RANKIN (DEPUTY CHAIRMAN)

DIANA ALBEMARLE

T C BENFIELD

MICHAEL CHISHOLM

ANDREW WHEATLEY

F B YOUNG

DAVID R SMITH (Secretary)

24 July 1975

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION

FOR ENGLAND

REVIEW OF ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

FOR THE

CITY OF LANCASTER

INFORMAL MEETING : 11 JUNE 1975.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER'S REPORT.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England.
Review of Electoral Arrangements - City of Lancaster.

Report of Assistant Commissioner on an informal
meeting held at Lancaster on 11 June 1975.

I presided at a local meeting held in the Council Chamber in the Town Hall, Lancaster, which opened at 10.00 hours on Wednesday 11 June 1975. The meeting was an informal one to hear representations on the draft proposals of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (hereinafter "the Commission") for revised electoral arrangements for the non-metropolitan district of the City of Lancaster.

The persons besides myself who attended the meeting are listed in Appendix A.

The Commissions proposals provide for a Council of 60 members to be elected from 29 wards, the names and boundaries of which are depicted on the map deposited with the draft proposals and verbally described in Annex A thereto.

Objection had been raised in written representations to the Commission prior to this meeting to four aspects of the draft proposals. These four subjects were :-

1. The proposal to name Ward No. 28 "Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Ward".
2. The warding and representation of the rural wards and in particular the proposed Caton and Ellel Wards.
3. The proposed warding of Scotforth West and Scotforth East Wards.
4. The proposed warding of the area formerly constituting the area of the Morecambe and Heysham Borough Council.

At the meeting these matters were discussed in turn, and they were the only matters discussed.

The following is my epitome of the representations made at the meeting on each of these matters, together with my assessment of the weight of the arguments advanced and my recommendations thereon.

1. Proposed Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Ward

Mr. Whiteley representing Overton Parish Council contended that this Ward should be named Overton Ward. It comprises the civil parishes of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe, Middleton and Overton. Of these three Overton is by far the largest in population and electorate. Overton C. of E. Parish Church is the only Anglican Church in the Ward, its Parochial Church Council serves the whole area of the Ward, and Overton C. of E. junior school similarly serves the area of the whole Ward. In all the other proposed wards for the rural areas of the District the wards are named after the largest component civil parish, and Mr. Whiteley could see no reason for departing from this course in this case. He instanced a number of cases which supported his argument. He went on to say that there had been no prior consultation with the parishes concerned regarding the name of this Ward as contemplated in para. 16 of the Commission's letter of 13 May 1974 to the Chief Executive of Lancaster District Council, but that since the publication of the draft proposals, representatives of the parishes concerned had discussed the matter and they were agreed that the Ward should be named Overton.

The representatives of Middleton parish expressed their agreement and the Leader of the City Council raised no objection. No objection was raised by any other person present.

I accept the argument put forward and recommend that Ward 28 be named Overton Ward.

2. Rural representation and the Caton and Ellel Wards

Councillor Robert Carr said he was an independent representative who had lived all his life in Ellel. The proposed Ellel Ward is a vast area of over 50 square miles, it comprises five parishes, the area is divided by the Lancaster Canal, and the Glasson and Galgate areas are completely different. The civil parish of Ellel has an electorate of 1900 whereas the total of the other four parishes is 1184, so the electorate from Ellel are going to return the councillors. It is not fair on the councillors to expect them to represent such a large area. Before reorganisation 7 rural councillors represented this area. He proposed that the Ward should be

divided in two, Ellel and Over Wyresdale comprising one ward with two councillors and Ashton-with-Stodday, Thurnham and Cockerham forming another ward with one councillor.

Major Garnett, Chairman of Quernmore Parish Council argued that the reduction in representation was illogical and not convenient for the electors. Quernmore was a large parish with a scattered population and no village centre. He deplored the reduction in representation.

The representative of Thurnham pointed out that two statutory bodies, British Waterways and the Port Commissioners operate in Glasson and the area needs an elected representative to deal with these bodies. The caravan rallies which occur in the area pose other problems.

The Clerk to the former Lancaster Rural District Council now retired and an elected representative supported the proposed boundaries as drawn but urged increased representation.

Mr. Walling also thought it unfair to expect two councillors only to represent satisfactorily such a large scattered area.

Councillor Lowthion also supported the case for 3 representatives from the proposed Ellel Ward. He instanced the difference between the Galgate area - a scattered farming area, and the Glasson area with its industry, tourism and fishing.

Further support for increased rural representation came from Councillor Mrs. Potts (Caton Ward) who stressed the distances involved and from Councillor Bibby. Councillor Rayner (Ellel) also urged the need for increased rural representation claiming that there are exceptional circumstances which justify increasing the overall size of the City Council beyond 60. These circumstances are the scattered nature of the population, the variety of interests and the distances involved which would impose conditions which two councillors could not fulfil properly. The effective representation of the people is (in his view) more important than compliance with a uniform ratio of electors to councillors.

Councillor Lodge representing the Labour Group on the City Council opposed any increase in rural representation. Six of the proposed rural wards were undersized in terms of their electorates, existing parishes could

not be divided for this purpose, the rural areas in any event should only have had 16 councillors whereas this proposed that they have 17, and if Ellel Ward is divided as suggested the Thurnham part would have one councillor representing 928 electors which is unreasonable. He did not consider that the circumstances of the District are exceptional to justify any overall increase in the size of the Council and his Group are strongly opposed to any increase in the rural representation if it is to be at the expense of the representation of the urban areas. Mr. Woolfenden supported this view and he pointed out that even councillors representing urban areas had difficulty in visiting all the electorate in their wards in the period of the statutory timetable for local elections.

Councillor Downey, Leader of the City Council was not opposed to a special case being made out for an overall increase of one or two in the City Council to provide for increased rural representation, but he was opposed to increased rural representation if it was to be at the expense of the urban representation.

I was impressed by the sincerity of the rural ward representatives and their sense of frustration at being faced with what appears to be a well nigh impossible task of representing effectively the electors of such diverse and scattered areas as comprise the proposed Caton and Ellel Wards. This however seems to me to be an inevitable consequence of the reorganisation wrought by the Local Government Act 1972 (hereinafter "the Act").

Section 78 (2) of the Act enjoins observance, so far as is reasonably practicable, of the rules set out in Schedule II. The relevant basic rules in para. 3 of that Schedule are -

the ratio of the number of electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district -

where the whole or part of the district has parishes, every parish shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district -

subject to the above rules, regard must be had also to the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable and of respecting any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular boundary.

These rules are statutory and I regard them as my prime considerations.

On the overall size of Councils the Act contains no provisions, but the Commission has in its Report No. 6 para. 30 adopted a range for non metropolitan district councils of 30 - 60 members, and it is considered that numbers above this range should not be proposed unless an exceptional case can be made out.

The size of the Council for the District of Lancaster is 60, and this is the number of councillors provided for in the proposals of both the City Council and the Commission. The total electorate of the District is 93,420 and the average number of electors per councillor is 1,557: in five years time the electorate is expected to number 98,580 and then the average number will be 1,643.

The draft arrangements submitted by the District Council on 30 Sept. 1974 and the arrangements proposed by the Commission, which are the subject of the present consultation, both suggest the same treatment for the wards in the rural areas of the District. The rural areas would have 17 councillors out of the 60, and this corresponds exactly to their entitlement according to the number of the electorate. These proposals of the District Council and the Commission with reference to the Caton and Ellel Wards and which are again identical, provide 2 councillors for each ward with the respective electorates of 2,883 and 3,084, which give an average per councillor of 1,441 and 1,542 respectively against the overall average of 1,557.

I conclude that no special case has been established for an increase in the overall size of the City Council. Such an increase is opposed by the Labour Group on the Council, increased rural representation would have to be matched by increased urban representation and this is not sought, and the basic argument put forward to justify the case, namely, the large and scattered nature of the area of Ellel Ward in particular, must obtain in many other parts of the country.

Assuming then that there is no increase in the overall size of the Council, any increase in the rural representation can only be at the expense of the urban areas. Such a course is objected to by the representatives of the urban areas, it is inconsistent with the rule requiring general equality of electors per councillor throughout the District, and the suggested subdivision of Ellel and Caton Wards with 2 councillors representing the areas of the parishes of Ellel, Over Wyresdale and Scotforth, 2 councillors

representing the areas of the parishes of Quernmore and Caton, and 1 representing Cockerham, Thurnham and Ashton-in-Stodday parishes, would result in the latter parishes with an electorate of 920 having 1 councillor, and both the other wards being over represented, but not so greatly.

I therefore recommend that the Commissions proposals for Caton and Ellel Wards be confirmed.

3. Scotforth West and Scotforth East Wards and the University

The City Council proposed a 2 member Ward for Scotforth West (electorate 2,868), a 3 member Ward for Scotforth East (electorate 4,516), these two Wards being divided along the A6, and a separate 1 member Ward for the University (electorate 1,591).

The Commission proposed two 3 member wards, Scotforth West (electorate 4,823) and Scotforth East (electorate 4,152) by an adjustment of boundaries to include the University in Scotforth East and to extend Scotforth West to the east of the A6 (in part).

At the meeting Mr. Hayton speaking for the Conservative representatives on the City Council, supported the Councils proposals. The ratio of electors per councillor was near to the average, the boundaries were better defined, the A6 tends to divide because of the volume of traffic using it, Rutland Avenue is a minor road and divides two small cross roads, Durham and Warwick Avenues which should not be divided, and the University is isolated at the southerly end of a peninsula of the District, a mile distant from Scotforth village. The University, he argued, is geographically separate from the rest of the District and should be treated as such electorally. The urban and university communities have distinct interests; students who comprise the bulk of the University electorate are not rate payers and cannot have the same concern how the rates are spent, and generally they only stay 3 or 4 years. On the other hand the proposal would ensure that the University was always represented on the City Council. In the University precinct there are shops, banks, a place of worship, a theatre and bars, and the University is a comparatively self contained community.

If the Wards had to be divided on the lines proposed by the Commission, Palatine Avenue would be a preferable boundary to Rutland Avenue.

Councillor Lodge supported the Commission's proposal. He thought it was wrong to separate town and gown. The site of the University had been deliberately added within the boundary of the former City of Lancaster and it ought to be integrated into the town. He referred to the abolition of University votes and business premises votes as indicating support for his argument. He also quoted the view of the Vice Chancellor of Lancaster University as recorded in the Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Court held on 14 Dec. 1974 where it is recorded on page 12 as follows :-

Councillor J.R. Lodge said that the new District Council had two views of the question of the University's representation on the District Council namely, (a) that there should be separate University representation, and (b) that the University should be part of the City and not an "elite", sharing its representation with other citizens. He wondered if the University had considered how it should be represented on the District Council. The Vice-Chancellor replied that no official University body had considered the matter but the views of the Local Government Boundary Commission (favouring (b)) had recently been received and his view would be to go along with the Commission's views.

Councillor Lodge also preferred Palatine Avenue to Rutland Avenue as a boundary..

Councillor John Ball who has lived all his life (47 years) in Scotforth and represents Scotforth on the City Council, and is also a member of the Court of Governors of the University strongly supported the City Council's proposal for a separate ward for the University. The people of Scotforth resented some of the students activities and were appalled at the thought that student representatives might represent them on the City Council.

On balance I favour the view of the City Council that the University should be a separate one member ward, and that the A6 should divide Scotforth West from Scotforth East. This proposal meets the criterion of ratio of electors per councillor, it uses better boundaries and on the whole appears to meet local preference.

For these reasons I recommend that the Council's proposals for a 3 member Scotforth East Ward, a 2 member Scotforth West Ward and a 1 member University Ward be adopted in substitution for the Commission's draft proposal for this part of the District, (subject to the minor boundary adjustment at Bailrigg Lane recommended by the Ordnance Survey in the interest of clear boundaries).

4. The Morecambe and Heysham Wards

Councillor Downey objected to the Commissions proposals for these Wards. He acknowledged that they resulted in a more equal ratio of electors per councillor, but the boundaries were not well defined in the sense that in many instances they did not follow main roads, and they did not accord with local communities of interest. He referred in particular to Parks and Poulton Wards which had for many years been divided by Broadway: he also referred to the centres of the old villages of Bare and Poulton, and he criticised the boundaries of Alexandra Ward as confusing, and not in accordance with the Commission's advice to follow main roads, railway lines etc. A new Ward centred on Westgate was justified. A lot of new development had taken place on both sides of Westgate and a great deal more was planned. A new church, and a new public house had been built recently on Westgate, also a shopping precinct, and a new county School was planned. The Council intended to develop a housing estate on Westgate as soon as certain detailed planning conditions had been cleared in the Department of the Environment. He also referred to plans for further development in Heysham. He supported in detail and whole heartedly the proposals put forward by the City Council for these Wards.

Mr. Park of the Morecambe and Lonsdale Conservative Association supported Councillor Downey's argument.

Councillor Langridge a representative of Victoria Ward opposed the suggested formation of a new Westgate Ward. He supported the Commissions proposal for Victoria Ward.

Councillor Elliot spoke in support of Councillor Downey and stressed the need for a new Westgate Ward. He argued that electors on or adjacent to Westgate at present had to make long journies to vote and this incurred hardship or caused them not to vote.

Councillor Lodge supported the Commission's proposals. He thought that the Council's proposals had the advantage of clear boundaries but they aggravated the inequalities in the elector/councillor ratio. In any event, once the new boundaries are established the Council would have to review the polling districts and stations.

Councillor Woolfenden also spoke in support of the Commission's proposals.

Councillor Dawson acknowledged that Parks Ward as proposed by the City Council was out of step so far as numbers were concerned, but he considered that community of interest and clear boundaries were more important than compliance with ratios. He supported Councillor Downey.

Councillor Downey in conclusion stated that the two parties in the Council had spent a long time discussing this problem but they could not agree on a conclusion. He claimed that the proposals he supported conformed to the Commission's guide lines.

There is no local agreement on this issue. I do not consider that a case for the establishment of a new Westgate Ward is made out; the development is not yet sufficient to justify the proposal, and while I consider some of the boundaries proposed by the Commission - those between Harbour Ward and Alexandra Ward and Alexandra Ward and Heysham North in particular - are poor, they are identifiable and seem likely to remain so. The argument in favour of the Commission's proposals which is to my mind overwhelming is the high degree of equality which they achieve in the ratio of electors to councillors which I regard as the prime statutory criterion.

I therefore recommend that the Commission's proposals for Wards in the Morecambe and Heysham area be confirmed without alteration.

I acknowledge that the alteration of ward boundaries which may have existed for many years must cause some ~~some~~ local dislocation of established patterns of voting, but this is inevitable in a reorganisation of local government, and it should be only temporary and minimal in a more or less fully developed urban area such as the part of Morecambe and Heysham lying seaward of the railway presents.

Heysham North Ward is an awkward shape with its tongue projecting eastwards, but I recommend no change, as this would introduce some imbalance

in the ratios, and the electors in that area are adjacent to Westgate, a main road served by local buses, which should afford reasonable access to the more built up part of the Ward.

On the 10 and 11 June I inspected the proposed ward boundaries in the Morecambe and Heysham area and on the 11 June I traversed the A6 between Scotforth West and Scotforth East Wards and visited the University.



P.P. BAYLEY-BROWN,
Assistant Commissioner.

19 June 1975.

SCHEDULE 2

CITY OF LANCASTER: NAMES OF PROPOSED WARDS AND NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS

NAME OF WARD	NO.OF COUNCILLORS
Alexandra	3
Arkholme	1
Bolton-le-Sands	2
Bulk	3
Carnforth	2
Castle	3
Caton	2
Ellel	2
Halton-with-Aughton	1
Harbour	2
Heysham Central	2
Heysham North	2
Heysham South	3
Hornby	1
John O'Gaunt	3
Kellet	1
Overton	1
Parks	2
Poulton	3
Scotforth East	3
Scotforth West	2
Silverdale	1
Skerton Central	2
Skerton East	2
Skerton West	2
Slyne-with-Hest	2
Torrisholme	2
University	1
Victoria	3
Warton	1

CITY OF LANCASTER: DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WARD BOUNDARIES

1. PARKS WARD

Commencing at a point where Hall Drive meets Broadway thence northwestwards along Broadway to the Morecambe to Carnforth Railway thence northeastwards along the said railway to a point opposite the eastern boundary of the property No 34 Ruskin Drive thence northwestwards to and along the said boundary to Sunnyfield Avenue thence northwards and northwestwards along the said avenue and Seaborn Road to Marine Road East thence due northwest in a straight line to low water being the District boundary thence northeastwards and following said District boundary to the southwestern boundary of Slyne-with-Hest CP thence southeastwards and following the said southwestern boundary to the Morecambe to Carnforth Railway thence southwestwards along said railway to Bare Lane thence southeastwards and following said lane to Hall Drive thence southwestwards along said drive to the point of commencement.

2. POULTON WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Parks Ward meets the Morecambe to Carnforth Railway thence southwestwards and westwards along the said railway and in prolongation thereof to Marine Road Central thence due northwestwards to low water being the District boundary thence northeastwards and following the said District boundary to the southwestern boundary of Parks Ward thence southeastwards and following the said ward boundary to the point of commencement.

3. VICTORIA WARD

Commencing at a point where the Morecambe to Heysham Railway meets the southern boundary of Poulton Ward thence eastwards and northeastwards along the said boundary to the western boundary of Parks Ward thence

southeastwards along the said boundary to Westgate thence southwestwards along Westgate to White Lund Road thence southwards along the said road to Banbury thence northwestwards along Banbury to Westgate thence southwestwards along Westgate to Altham Road thence northwestwards along the said road and in prolongation thereof to the Morecambe to Heysham Railway thence northeastwards and following the said railway to the point of commencement.

4. HARBOUR WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Poulton Ward meets low water level thence southeastwards along said boundary and the southwestern boundary of Victoria Ward to White Lund Road thence southwards along the said road to the northern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP thence westwards along and following the said boundary to a point opposite the eastern boundaries of the properties Nos 20 to 2 Westgate Avenue and No 100 Westgate thence northwards to and along the said boundaries to Westgate thence southeastwards along Westgate to a point opposite the eastern boundary of Parcel No 2308 as shown on 1:2500 Ordnance Survey Plan SD 4263 - 4363 Edition of 1962 thence northwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Parcel No 2120 to a point opposite the southern end of Ellesmere Road thence northwestwards to and along the said road to Buckingham Road thence northeastwards along the said road to Acre Moss Lane thence northwards along the said lane to Albany Road thence generally northwestwards along the said road to West End Road thence westwards and northwestwards along said road to Marine Road West thence due northwestwards in a straight line to low water level being the District boundary thence northeastwards along low water to the point of commencement.

5. ALEXANDRA WARD

Commencing at a point where the western boundary of Harbour Ward meets low water level thence southeastwards and following said boundary to

Westgate thence northwestwards along Westgate to the Morecambe to Heysham Railway thence southwestwards along the said railway to a point opposite the southern boundary of the property No 15 Buckingham Grove thence to and along the said boundary and continuing northwestwards along the southern boundaries of the properties Nos 94 to 83 Buckingham Road, Nos 94 to 85 Osborne Road, Nos 4 to 10 Osborne Crescent and the northern boundary of Balmoral County Secondary School to Balmoral Road thence northeastwards along the said road to Avondale Road thence northwestwards along the said road to the southwestern boundary of the property No 179 Westminster Road thence northwestwards along the said boundary and thence in a straight line to the southwestern boundary of the property No 20 Grafton Road thence northwestwards along the said boundary to Gardner Road thence northwestwards along the said road to the southwestern boundary of property No 19 Brunswick Road thence northwestwards along the said boundary and in a straight line to the southwestern boundary of the property No 16 Marlborough Road thence northwestwards along the said boundary to Marlborough Road thence southwestwards along the said road to Bold Street thence northwestwards along the said street to Marine Road West thence due northwestwards in a straight line to low water level being the District boundary thence northeastwards and following low water level to the point of commencement.

6. HEYSHAM NORTH WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Alexandra Ward meets low water level thence southeastwards and following the said boundary to the southern boundary of Harbour Ward thence eastwards and southwards along the said boundary to the northern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP thence westwards and following the said boundary to the western boundary of Parcel No 9300 as shown on 1:2500 Ordnance Survey Plan SD 4261 - 4361 Edition of 1964 thence northwestwards along the said boundary as shown on Ordnance Survey Plan SD 4262 - 4362 Edition of 1963 to Oxcliffe Road thence southwestwards and following said road to Woodlands Drive thence northwestwards along said drive to Fairfield Road thence northwestwards

and following the said road to Heysham Road, thence northeastwards along said road to Craig Street, thence northwestwards along said street to Sandylands Promenade, thence due west in a straight line to Low Water level being the District boundary, thence northwards and following Low Water to the point of commencement.

7. HEYSHAM CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Heysham North Ward meets Low Water level, thence eastwards and following said boundary to Oxcliffe Road, thence northwestwards along the said road to Kingsway, thence southwestwards along Kingsway to Sugham Lane, thence southwestwards along the said lane to Heysham Road, thence southwards along said road to Knowllys Road, thence southwestwards along said road to the footpath opposite the northern end of Eardley Road, thence northwestwards along said footpath to the footpath running northeastwards from Bailey Lane, thence due northwestwards in a straight line to Low Water level, being the District boundary, thence northeastwards and following Low Water to the point of commencement.

8. HEYSHAM SOUTH WARD

Commencing at a point where the southwestern boundary of Heysham Central Ward meets Low Water level, thence southeastwards and following the southwestern and southern boundaries of the said ward to the western boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP, thence southeastwards along said boundary to the northern boundary of Middleton CP, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to Low Water level, being the District boundary, thence northeastwards and following Low Water to the point of commencement.

9. TORRISHOLME WARD

Commencing at a point where the southeastern boundary of Westgate Ward meets the northern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP, thence northeastwards along said boundary and the southeastern boundaries of Victoria Ward and Parks Ward to the western boundary of Slyne-with-Hest CP, thence northeastwards and following said boundary to Barley Cop Lane, thence northwestwards along said lane to Torrisholme Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the northwestern boundary of No 169 Torrisholme Road.

thence southwestwards to and along said boundary to the rear boundaries of Nos 169 to 151 Torrisholme Road, thence southeastwards along said rear boundaries to the north western boundary of Cross Hill Congregational Church, thence southwestwards along said boundary and southeastwards along the rear boundary of said Church to the southeastern boundary of parcel No 1131 as shown on OS 1:2500 plan SD 4663 edition of 1959, thence southwestwards along said boundary and the southeastern boundaries of parcels No 0822 and 0325 to the northeastern boundary of parcel No 0211, thence southeastwards along said boundary and southwestwards along the southeastern boundary of said parcel to Morecambe Road, thence southeastwards along said road to a point opposite the southeastern boundary of No 146 Morecambe Road, thence southwestwards in a straight line to the northern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP, thence westwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

10. SKERTON WEST WARD

Commencing at the northernmost point where the eastern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP meets the Rive Lune, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the eastern boundary of Torrisholme Ward thence northeastwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Slyne-with-Hest CP, thence northeastwards along said boundary to the Lancaster to Carnforth Railway, thence southeastwards along said railway to the Rive Lune, thence southwestwards along said river to the point of commencement.

11. SKERTON CENTRAL WARD

Commencing at the southeastern corner of Skerton West Ward, thence northwards along the eastern bdy of the said ward to the southern bdy of Slyne-with-Hest CP, thence northeastwards and following said bdy to Slyne Road, thence southeastwards and southwards along said road and southeastwards along

Owen Road to the River Lune, thence southwestwards and following said River to the point of commencement.

12. SKERTON EAST WARD

Commencing at the southeastern corner of Skerton Central Ward, thence northwestwards and following the eastern bdy of the said ward to the southern boundary of Slyne-with-Hest CP, thence northwards and following said boundary to the southern boundary of Halton-with-Aughton CP, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to the River Lune, thence southwestwards along said river to the point of commencement.

13. CASTLE WARD

Commencing at a point on the eastern bdy of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP due west of the level crossing on Railway Crossing Lane, thence northwestwards and following said bdy to the southern bdy of Skerton West Ward, thence northeastwards along said bdy to the southern bdy of Skerton Central Ward, thence southeastwards along said bdy to the prolongation northeastwards of Vicarage Lane, thence southwestwards along said prolongation to St George's Quay, thence southeastwards along said quay and Damside Street to China Street, thence southwestwards along said street to King Street, thence southeastwards along said street and Penny Street to the Lancaster Canal North End, thence southwestwards along said canal to Haverbreaks Bridge, thence northwestwards along said bridge to Aldcliffe Road, thence southwestwards and following said road to the Lane from Bank Farm to the level crossing, thence westwards and following said lane to the level crossing, thence in a straight line due west to the point of commencement.

14. BULK WARD

Commencing at a point where the eastern boundary of Castle Ward meets the southern boundary of Skerton Central Ward, thence southeastwards and following said southern boundary to the eastern boundary of Skerton East Ward, thence

northeastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Quernmore CP, thence southeastwards and following said boundary to Quernmore Road, thence northwestwards and following said road to East Road, thence westwards along said road, Nelson Street, Brock Street and Common Garden Street to the eastern boundary of Castle Ward, thence northwestwards and following said boundary to the point of commencement.

15. JOHN O'GAUNT WARD

Commencing at a point where the road running northwest of Blea Tarn Reservoir to Bowerham Lane meets the western boundary of Scotforth CP, thence northwestwards and following the said road to Bowerham Lane, thence northwards along said lane to Bowerham Road, thence northwestwards along the said road to South Road, thence northwestwards along the said road to the eastern boundary of Castle Ward, thence northwestwards along said boundary to the southern boundary of Bulk Ward, thence eastwards and following the said boundary to the western boundary of Quernmore CP, thence southwestwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Scotforth CP, thence southwestwards and following the said boundary to the point of commencement.

16. SCOTFORTH WEST WARD

Commencing at a point where the northern boundary of Ashton with Stodday CP meets the eastern boundary of Overton CP, thence northwards and following said eastern boundary and the eastern boundary of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe CP to the southern boundary of Castle ward, thence eastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of John O'Gaunt Ward, thence southeastwards and following the said boundary and continuing along the A6 road to a point opposite the northern boundary of Scotforth CP (Det), thence westwards to and along the said boundary and the northern boundary of Ashton with Stodday CP to the point of commencement.

17. SCOTFORTH EAST WARD

Commencing at a point where Bailrigg Lane meets the eastern boundary of Scotforth CP (Det); thence northwards along said boundary and the eastern boundary of Scotforth West Ward to the southwestern boundary of John OGaunt Ward; thence generally southeastwards and following said boundary to the western boundary of Scotforth CP; thence southwestwards and following said boundary to Bailrigg Lane; thence westwards along said lane to the point of commencement.

18. UNIVERSITY WARD

Commencing at a point where the southern boundary of Scotforth East Ward meets the eastern boundary of Scotforth CP (Det); thence eastwards along said southern boundary to the western boundary of Scotforth CP; thence eastwards and following said parish boundary to the northern boundary of Ellel CP; thence southwards and following said parish boundary to the eastern boundary of Scotforth CP (Det); thence northwards along said eastern boundary to the point of commencement.

19. SILVERDALE WARD

The parishes of Silverdale, Yealand Conyers and Yealand Redmayne.

20. WARTON WARD

The parish of Warton

21. KELLET WARD

The parishes of Priest Hutton, Borwick, Over Kellet and Nether Kellet

22. ARKHOLME WARD

The parishes of Whittington, Burrow-with-Burrow, Leck, Ireby, Tunstall, Cantsfield, Melling-with-Wrayton, Arkholme-with-Cawood and Gressingham.

23. CARNFORTH WARD

The parish of Carnforth

24. BOLTON-LE-SANDS WARD

The parish of Bolton-le-Sands

25. SLYNE-WITH-HEST WARD

The parish of Slyne-with-Hest

26. HALTON-WITH-AUGHTON WARD

The parish of Halton-with-Aughton

27. HORNBY WARD

The parishes of Hornby-with-Farleton, Wennington. Claughton, Tatham, Wray-with-Botton and Roeburndale.

28. CATON WARD

The parishes of Caton-with-Littledale, Quernmore and Scotforth.

29. OVERTON WARD

The parishes of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe, Middleton and Overton.

30. ELLEL WARD

The parishes of Ashton-with-Stodday, Cockerham, Ellel, Thurnham and Over Wyresdale.

Note.

Low Water level when mentioned in any of the above descriptions refers to the Low Water level for the time being.