ELECTORAL REVIEW OF SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL: Response to Boundary Commission Consultation
Response to Consultation

The following are the Council’s comments on the Boundary Commissions recommended new electoral arrangements for South Ribble Borough Council.

Council Size

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for a Council size of 50.

Western Parishes

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

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

The Boundary Commissions proposals for the Western Parishes were substantially in line with the Council’s submission with exception of the area around Ratten Lane, Hutton. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Commission’s proposals were not as electorally balanced as the Council’s submission the rationale behind the proposal was understood and it was therefore proposed that the Commission’s proposals be accepted.

New Longton and Hutton East Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward.

Longton and Hutton West Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward.

Little Hoole and Much Hoole Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries for this ward. However, in view of the fact that the ward has been known for some time as Little Hoole and Much Hoole and comprises the two separate parishes of Little Hoole and Much Hoole the council suggests that the ward should retain its name of Little Hoole and Much Hoole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Longton and Hutton East</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longton and Hutton West</td>
<td>5196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minus 7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Hoole and Much Hoole</td>
<td>3551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Penwortham

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

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

The council accepts the majority of the proposals put forward by the Commission; however, the council still proposes that there should be a single member ward for Kingsfold and a two member ward for Middleforth as proposed in the council’s original submission.

Howick and Priory Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward.

Broadoak Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward.

Charnock Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward.

Kingsfold and Middleforth Wards

The council again proposes that there should be a single member ward for Kingsfold and a two member ward for Middleforth as proposed in the council’s original submission.

Kingsfold has a strong sense of identity in its own right having its own school, library and community centre. The area of Middleforth is the oldest part of Penwortham being much older than the community of Kingsfold with no community cohesion between the two.

Councillor Melvyn Gardner, who is the Conservatives representative for Penwortham on the Boundary Committee, asked for the following to be included.

“I have asked a few people in Kingsfold, (not enough for an opinion poll), but none the less the inference is that they associate being part of the Kingsfold Community. We feel that Kingsfold is an integral part in itself, and should remain so, this can be done only by having a representative to speak up for the people of Kingsfold, thus this merits a single seat ward.

From other parts of Penwortham there are signs pointing to Kingsfold, there is a Kingsfold School, Library, Health Centre and even a Kingsfold Activity Area outside of the Community Centre, surely this points to a singular community in this part of Penwortham and can no way be tethered to Middleforth.
Middleforth is an old part of Penwortham and is much older than Kingsfold and is totally separate and there is no community cohesion between the two. I therefore earnestly request that in a true democratic way, the people of Kingsfold should have the right to keep the name Kingsfold for the reasons mentioned above.”

The council has also received a letter from Penwortham Town Councillor Joan Burrows which confirms the view of the Council that they are two separate communities. The letter is attached to this report (appendix E).

The electorate for the proposed Kingsfold area matches the ideal electorate ratio for a single member ward and the council therefore suggests that this community justifies a single member ward in its own right.

The council suggests that if the Commission accepts the splitting of the Commission’s proposed Middleforth Ward. The two wards be named Kingsfold and Middleforth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howick and Priory</td>
<td>5883</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plus 4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadoak</td>
<td>3998</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charnock</td>
<td>3974</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsfold</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plus 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleforth</td>
<td>3849</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 seven councillors.

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

The council agrees with the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for Farington East and Farington West subject to the amendments to the northern and southern boundaries to create stronger borough parish boundaries. However, the Council does not agree with the Boundary Commission’s proposed Lostock Hall ward and feels that the issues identified in the Council’s submission have not been addressed.

Farington East Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward subject to the amendments to the northern and southern boundaries to create stronger borough parish boundaries.

It is thought that the existing southern boundary, which is also the current Farington Parish Boundary, must have followed an old watercourse for part of its length. In addition, a new development of Parish Gardens has been built and the existing boundary dissects many individual properties within this street and therefore is currently split between two wards. The council would like to create a stronger boundary around Parish Gardens (see Map 1) which would also ensure all the properties on this street are in the same ward.

Also towards the southern boundary of Farington East are two large developments. The first development (Development A on Map 1) is dissected into two by the existing southern borough/parish boundary. If this boundary is maintained as a borough/parish boundary it is likely that it would recreate the existing problems on Parish Gardens where individual properties are split between two wards. The access to this development will be from Carr Lane and Wheelton Lane and as both are within Farington East the council suggest that the whole of this development should be included within Farington East. The whole of the second development (Development B on Map 1) is currently within Farington East ward. However, this proposed development will only be accessed from Northgate which is within the Commission’s proposed Turpin Green ward and therefore the council suggests that this development should be included within the Council’s proposed St Ambrose ward.
Within the Commission’s report (paragraph 50) it states that all Lever House Lane should be included in the Farington East Ward. However, this is not reflected in the Boundary Commission’s map (see Map 2) as 1-33 Lever House Lane (odds) have been included within the Commission’s Turpin Green ward. It is therefore suggested that these properties be included within Farington East. In addition, the four properties on Convent Close which are accessed from Lever House Lane should also be included within Farington East.
It is also suggested to slightly amend the northern boundary of this ward so that there is a stronger boundary which follows the centre line of the A582 and the A6. (Map 3)

As it is intended to undertake a Community Governance Review due to other changes elsewhere within Farington Parish Council, the borough council would like to take this opportunity to create a stronger borough/parish boundary as described above.

**Farington West Ward**

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for this ward subject to the amendments to the southern boundary to create stronger borough and parish boundaries (Map 4). It is thought that the existing southern boundary, which is also the current Farington Parish Boundary, must have followed an old watercourse for part of its length.

As it is intended to undertake a Community Governance Review due to other changes elsewhere within Farington Parish Council, the borough council would like to take this opportunity to create a stronger borough/parish boundary along the southern part of this ward which would mainly follow the River Lostock.
Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate

There are two areas of the Commission’s proposed Lostock Hall ward which the Council does not agree with and therefore suggests it should be amended accordingly.

The first area which the Council suggests changes to is in the north west of the ward and concerns the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way. This small area has no direct transport links to Lostock Hall without travelling some distance outside the proposed Lostock Hall ward. This area will have greater community cohesion with a large amount of development, over 270 properties, which will all be accessed from The Cawsey. Before all of this development is commenced the new proposed link road, which has now been approved by the council’s Planning Committee, must be completed. This link road will adjoin the existing properties in the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way and the new properties which will be accessed off The Cawsey. The council therefore suggests that this area would have a closer relationship with Walton-le-Dale than Lostock Hall and requests that this area be included within Walton-le-Dale West Ward. (Map 5)

The second area which the council does not agree with is the area to the south of the Commission’s proposed Walton-le-Dale West ward which includes the area around Todd Lane North (Map 6). This area should definitely be included within Lostock Hall and not Walton-le-Dale. All the properties in this area have Lostock Hall postal address and are part of the Lostock Hall community and not Walton Park.
Councillor Cliff Hughes, who is the Conservatives representative for Central on the Boundary Committee, asked for the following to be included.

“Following your rejection of the Council’s proposals for the Lostock Hall/Tardy Gate Ward, which as Councillor for almost 30 years, I believe were perfectly valid and appropriate, I now wish to record my support for the compromise now being proposed by the Council. Your suggestion of completely changing the character of the ward is in my opinion flawed.

There is no connectivity between the Lostock Hall/Tardy Gate Ward and the new developments (Sites DD: K and F in the newly adopted Local Plan) at the old Gas Works and Vernon Carus areas, designed to be wholly serviced from Leyland Road and Carr Wood area by The Cawsey, which is scheduled to be completed before these new boundaries come into play.

It is also crucial that Lindale Avenue /Highfield Avenue and that part of Todd Lane North are retained in the Lostock Hall/Tardy Gate Ward as they are integral to the area, a natural boundary will be created to the north between this community and Carr Wood by the new “Central Park” and the electoral numbers will be needed following the removal of Gas Works: Vernon Carus: Bellis Way and High Meadow.

I would welcome the opportunity to meet with you and explain my concerns prior to your final deliberations.”

The council suggests that the ward should be named Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wards</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Councillors</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farington East</strong></td>
<td>3634</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farington West</strong></td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate</strong></td>
<td>5592</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minus 0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parish Electoral Arrangements

Farington Parish Council

The Boundary Commission proposed three wards Farington Central: 3 Members, Farington East: 2 Members, Farington West: 3 Members. As Farington West appears to have the smallest electorate it is suggested that this should be reconsidered to ensure some electoral equality.
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 council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for Samlesbury and Walton.

However, the council was aware that there was an error in the Commission’s figure for the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward where a large number of existing properties and a new development had been omitted when moving the area around Walton Summit into Coupe Green and Gregson Lane from Bamber Bridge East. This effectively meant that the Council’s original submissions for Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West and Walton-le-Dale East provided better electoral equality.

Therefore, with the exception of a few minor amendments outlined below, which would provide a better community boundary, the wards of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West and Walton-le-Dale East be as the council’s original submission. It is suggested that there should be three amendments to the Walton-le-Dale West ward. These changes are where we have joined areas which have a greater community relationship or ensures that the ward is more electorally balanced.

Samlesbury and Walton Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for Samlesbury and Walton.

Walton-le-Dale West Ward

The council has proposed three amendments to the Commission’s proposed Walton-le-Dale West ward.

The first is to the south west of the ward and concerns the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way (see Map 5). This small area has no direct transport links to Lostock Hall without travelling some distance outside the proposed Lostock Hall ward. This area will have a greater community cohesion with a large amount of development, over 270 properties, which will all be accessed from The Cawsey. Before all of this development is commenced the new proposed link road, which has now been approved by the council’s Planning Committee, must be completed. This link road will adjoin the existing properties in the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way and the new properties which will be accessed off The Cawsey. The council therefore suggests that this area would have a closer relationship with Walton-le-Dale than Lostock Hall and requests that this area be included within Walton-le-Dale West Ward.

The second area is the area to the south of the Commission’s proposed Walton-le-Dale West ward which includes the area around Todd Lane North (see Map 6). This area should definitely be included within Lostock Hall and not Walton-le-Dale. All the properties in this area have Lostock Hall postal address and are part of the Lostock Hall community and not Walton Park.
The third amendment is being suggested to make the ward more electorally balanced. The proposal reflects that proposed by Councillor O'Hare as part of the first consultation. This would move 46 properties on Chorley Road, 19 properties on Hunters Lodge and one property on Duddle Lane from Walton-le-Dale West to Walton-le-Dale East. (Map 7)

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward name for Walton-le-Dale West.

**Walton-le-Dale East Ward**

Following the Commissions error to the figures in Coupe Green & Gregson Lane/Bamber Bridge East the council suggests that the council’s original proposal, with the exception of two minor amendments as outlined below.

The first amendment is being suggested to make Walton-le-Dale West ward more electorally balanced. The proposal reflects that proposed by Councillor O'Hare as part of the first consultation. This would move 46 properties on Chorley Road, 19 properties on Hunters Lodge and one property on Duddle Lane from Walton-le-Dale West to Walton-le-Dale East. (Map 7)

The second amendment is to the south east of the Walton-le-Dale East ward (Map 8). This has been undertaken to make the ward more electorally balanced and to reflect a better community boundary. The amendment would see part of Brindle Road and the area around Brown Lane moving from Walton-le-Dale East to Bamber Bridge East. This would also move Walton-le-Dale Arts College and High School so that it is within the ward of Walton-le-Dale East.
Councillor Andrea Ball, who is one of the ward councillors for the current Bamber Bridge North ward (proposed to change to Walton-le-Dale East), has asked for the following to be included.

“Further to the first consultation I accept and agree with the change in name from Bamber Bridge North to Walton-le-Dale East. Having looked at this area and noting that the council are amending the boundaries I have to agree with the amendments in this area. The residents in this ward do recognise land marks to distinguish their boundaries; in ensuring that Walton-le-Dale Arts College and High School is kept in this ward will in fact help consolidate this as the Walton-le-Dale East Ward that residents acknowledge at this time. The main issue is in the name change as residents will be able to identify with where they live and as this has been accepted the alterations to the boundary proposed by the council will ensure that residents in the ward of Walton-le-Dale East will now have more acceptable and comprehensible identification markers.”

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward name for Walton-le-Dale East.

**Coupe Green and Gregson Lane Ward**

The council is aware that there was an error in the Commission’s figure for the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward where a large number of existing properties and a new development had been omitted when moving the area around Walton Summit into Coupe Green and Gregson Lane from Bamber Bridge East. Therefore, the council suggests that Boundary Commission should adopt the Council’s original submission.

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward name for Coupe Green and Gregson Lane.
**Bamber Bridge East**

The council is aware that there was an error in the Commission’s figure for the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward where a large number of existing properties and a new development had been omitted when moving the area around Walton Summit into Coupe Green and Gregson Lane from Bamber Bridge East. Therefore, the council suggests that Boundary Commission should adopt the Council’s original submission subject to the following minor boundary amendment.

This amendment has been undertaken to make the ward more electorally balanced and to reflect a better community boundary. It is to the north east of the ward and would see part of Brindle Road and the area around Brown Lane moving from Walton-le-Dale East to Bamber Bridge East. This would also move Walton-le-Dale Arts College and High School so that it is within the ward of Walton-le-Dale East. (Map 8)

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward name for Bamber Bridge East.

**Bamber Bridge West**

Following the Commissions error to the figures in Coupe Green & Gregson Lane/Bamber Bridge East the council suggests that the Commission accepts the council’s original proposal for Bamber Bridge West. Detailed below is an extract from the council’s report submitted as part of the first consultation.

“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.”

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward name for Bamber Bridge West.

<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>3924</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton-le-Dale East</td>
<td>3515</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupe Green and Gregson Lane</td>
<td>3813</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamber Bridge East</td>
<td>3973</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plus 5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamber Bridge West</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minus 4.3%</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.

The council agrees with the Boundary Commission’s proposals in respect of the wards in Leyland with the exception of Earnshaw Bridge and its boundary with Wade Hall and the northern boundary of Leyland with Farington Parish Council with particular reference to Lever House Lane.

The council noted the Commissions reluctance to accept the Council’s submission for Buckshaw Village that it was a special case and that it would be best served as a single member ward. By merging Buckshaw with the Worden area the other wards proposed by the Commission are generally acceptable. However, the council considered that the Commission’s proposals for the Earnshaw Bridge Ward was a somewhat odd shape and tried to join two distinct communities and would be more suited to be split into two single member wards.

Reference was also made to the northern boundary of Leyland with Farington Parish Council where the Council’s submission and the Labour Group’s submission were substantially the same but which the Commission had not accepted.

Buckshaw and Worden Ward

The Committee noted the Commissions reluctance to accept the Council’s submission for Buckshaw Village that it was a special case and would be best served as a single member ward. By merging Buckshaw with the Worden area the other wards proposed by the Commission where generally acceptable.

Therefore, the council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for Buckshaw and Worden.

Seven Stars Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals, subjects to a couple of minor amendments to the northern boundary to ensure that Earnshaw Bridge is more electorally balanced and to reflect a better community boundary. This would see part of Dunkirk Lane and part of Leyland Lane, Dunkirk Mews, Mill Street, Grove Street and Brook Close moving from the northern part of the Commission’s proposed Earnshaw Bridge ward into the council’s proposed Seven Stars ward. In addition, there are two properties on Mill Lane which the Commission currently has in the Broadfield ward. The council would also like to move these two properties into the council’s proposed Seven Stars ward so that they are with the rest of the Mill Lane properties. If the Commission do not agree with the council’s proposals for the boundaries for Seven Stars, Earnshaw Bridge and Dunkirk Wards, the council would still like to see these two properties moved as they only have pedestrian access to the Broadfield ward.

The Council suggests that the ward name should be Seven Stars as Wade Hall is only a distinctive small part of the ward and whilst Seven Stars covers a much greater area.
Moss Side and Midge Hall Ward

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries for Moss Side. However, the council suggests that the ward would be more descriptively named if it was called Moss Side and Midge Hall.

Earnshaw Bridge Ward

The Council considers that the Commission's proposal for the Earnshaw Bridge Ward is a somewhat odd shape. Where the two distinct communities meet, the proposed ward narrows and the two communities are only joined together by approximately 160 metres at the pinch point. The council suggests that it would be more suitable to be split into two single member wards. It is therefore suggested that the Commission's proposed Earnshaw Bridge ward should be split where it is joined at the A5253 and is only 160 metres wide to create two single member wards. (Maps 10 and 11)
To ensure that Earnshaw Bridge is more electorally balanced and to reflect a better community boundary the council proposes to see part of Dunkirk Lane and part of Leyland Lane, Dunkirk Mews, Mill Street, Grove Street and Brook Close move from the northern part of the Commission’s proposed Earnshaw Bridge ward into the council’s proposed Seven Stars ward. In addition, there are two properties on Mill Lane which the Commission currently has in the Broadfield ward. The council would also like to move these two properties into the council’s proposed Seven Stars ward so that they are with the rest of the Mill Lane properties. If the Commission does not agree with the council’s proposals for the boundaries for Seven Stars, Earnshaw Bridge and Dunkirk Wards, the council would still like to see these two properties moved as they only have pedestrian access to the Broadfield ward. (Map 9)

The council suggests that the northern of the two wards should be named Earnshaw Bridge Ward.

**Dunkirk**

Further to the comments outlined above for Earnshaw Bridge, this would be the second single member ward created (Maps 10 and 11). The council suggests that this ward should be named Dunkirk. Justifications for this ward name are that it includes the majority of Dunkirk Lane and Dunkirk Hall, which is a Grade II listed building, being built in the reign of Charles I. More recently in 1983 the hall has been tastefully renovated becoming a public house. The name Dunkirk first appeared in a survey book of Leyland of 1725. The area also includes the Lancashire Army Cadet Force Dunkirk Detachment Royal Artillery Centre.
**Leyland Central**

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries for the Commission’s Bannister Brook ward with the exception of the following minor amendment.

Within the comments for Farington East (Map 1), the council suggests amendments to the southern boundary of Farington East with its boundary to the Commission’s Turpin Green ward, to create a stronger borough and parish boundary. This relates to the boundary around Parish Gardens and the proposed development off Carr Lane and Northgate.

The council would like to suggest the ward name Leyland Central for this ward. Bannister Brook only flows through a small part of this ward and the majority of the brook is within the Broadfield ward. The ward is at the centre of Leyland and contains the whole of Leyland Town Centre and it therefore suggested that this ward would be better named Leyland Central.

**St Ambrose Ward**

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries for the Boundary Commission’s Turpin Green ward with the exception of the following minor amendments.

Within the Commission’s report (paragraph 50) it states that all Lever House Lane should be included in the Farington East Ward. However, this is not reflected in the Boundary Commission’s map (Map 2) as 1-33 Lever House Lane (odds) have been included within the Commission’s Turpin Green ward. It is therefore suggested that these properties be included within Farington East. In addition, the four properties on Convent Close which are accessed from Lever House Lane should also be included within Farington East.

The council would like to suggest its original recommendation of St Ambrose as the ward name. Turpin Green Lane is only a road at the edge of the ward and not a specific area. Half of the road is also within the Commission’s proposed Bannister Brook ward which could cause confusion for the residents of Turpin Green Lane who aren’t in the Turpin Green ward. Although St Ambrose does not cover the whole of the ward, residents would associate themselves more with the name of St Ambrose rather than Turpin Green.

The council therefore suggests St Ambrose as the ward name.

**Broadfield Ward**

The council accepts the Boundary Commission’s proposals for the ward boundaries and ward name for Broadfield. The only exception to this are two properties on Mill Lane which the council would like to move from Broadfield into the council’s proposed Seven Stars ward so that they are with the rest of the Mill Lane properties. If the Commission does not agree with the council’s proposals for the boundaries for Seven Stars, Earnshaw Bridge and Dunkirk Wards, the council would still like to see these two properties moved as they only have pedestrian access to the Broadfield ward. (Map 9)

However, as stated within the comments for Farington West, the council suggests amendments to the southern boundary of Farington West with its boundary with Broadfield, to create a stronger borough and parish boundary.
Table 1 shows the current position on electoral equality, based on 2012 electorate figures and what it is projected to be based on 2019 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements: Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>1707</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 revised proposals on electoral equality, based on 2019 electorate figures and what it projected to be based on 2019 electorate figures.

Table 2: Summary of electoral arrangements: Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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>1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 4.15 p.m. on Tuesday, 22\textsuperscript{nd} October, 2013 in the 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, Pimblett, P Smith and Watts.

In Attendance:-

Democratic Services Manager (Martin O’Loughlin)

Public Attendance:-

Nil

Other Members and Officers:-

Councillors M Green, Howarth, M Tomlinson, G Walton, and Chief Executive (Mike Nuttall).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No apologies for absence were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</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, 8\textsuperscript{th} July, 2013 be signed as a correct record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Electoral Review of South Ribble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Councillor Mrs Smith introduced this item and referred to the draft proposals that had now been received from the Commission.

She informed the Committee that following receipt of the proposals clarification had been sought on a number of issues within the proposals.

The response of the Commission was reported to members and is attached as an Appendix to these minutes.

Members expressed their initial views on the proposals which was mixed with some members generally supportive and others raising specific issues.

Areas of concern raised by some members were the Leyland/Farington East boundary, Lostock/Walton-le-Dale West boundary, the proposed ward of Middleforth, Leyland generally, and the revised boundary of Longton and Hutton West and New Longton and Hutton East.

Members also commented that some of the proposed ward name were somewhat perverse and suggested that Bannister Brook would be better as Leyland Central, Wade Hall should be Seven Stars, and Earnshaw Bridge probably Lostock.

The Chairman, acknowledged the fact that members had only a short time to consider the Commission’s proposals as they had only been made public on 15 October 2013 and proposed that members consider the proposals further and bring any amendments or changes to either warding arrangements or ward names to the next meeting in order to make recommendations to the Council meeting on 20th November.

It was agreed to consider the proposals further and bring any amendments or changes to either warding arrangements or ward names to the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21</th>
<th>Forthcoming Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members noted that a meeting had been arranged for Monday 4 November 2013 at 4.15pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting closed at 4.53pm.

................................................................. Chairman
Boundary Commission's Response to initial request for clarification

(1) Farington

Southern Boundary of Farington Parish Boundary

Within the report (Para 50) it states that “We also propose a modification to the northern boundary of the Leyland East Ward – rather than dividing Lever House Lane between wards, it should all be included in a Farington East Ward.” The Boundary Commissions map does not reflect this as Lever House Lane is still split between two wards as houses 1-33 (odds) still remain in the proposed Turpin Green Ward. If this was to occur it would also make sense to include the four properties on Convent Close as they can only be accessed from Lever House Lane.

The council proposed a small amendment to the southern boundary of Farington Parish Council between Farington West and Broadfield Wards to move a small number of properties on Barn Hey Drive into Farington West. This was required because Barn Hey Drive was a new development and was built straddling the ward boundary. The ward boundary ended up going through the middle of a number of properties which has caused problems about whether they were in or out of the parish council. This amendment has been incorporated in your proposals.

However, the same problem occurred further east along the southern boundary with Parish Gardens where the existing boundary goes directly through a number of properties. The Commission’s report states that it agrees with all councils proposals for Farington with the exception of a small part of Lever House Lane. Despite this, this amendment hasn’t been reflected in the Boundary Commission’s proposals.

Can you let us know why these haven’t been included?

Boundary Commission’s Response

*If we had used a ward boundary that was different from the parish boundary around Parish Gardens then we would have created a parish ward in Farington which would have had too few electors in it to have been viable – i.e. fewer than 100 electors. In terms of Convent Close, this is an area we could consider including in Farington East when we consider the formulation of our final recommendations subject to representations and evidence we receive during consultation.*

There is also a proposed development which spreads over the proposed boundaries of Farington East, Turpin Green and Bannister Brook. The councils proposals was to follow the external boundary of this development site to eliminate the problems experienced at Barn hey Drive and Parish Gardens where ward boundaries would go directly through properties. Again, the Commission’s report does not make any reference to not accepting this boundary. However, this is not reflected in the proposal map.
Can you let us know why these haven’t been included?

Boundary Commission’s Response

*Our proposed boundaries for this area were chosen to reflect existing road connections and community links. We would certainly consider amendments to these boundaries in light of evidence showing that the boundaries would split communities.*

Because of the changes in the three amendments outlined above, which would therefore require a parish review to be undertaken, the council thought it was an ideal opportunity to tidy some of the parish boundaries which historically followed roads or watercourses which no longer exists. None of these changes would amend the electorate but would provide more identifiable boundaries. Again these changes have not been incorporated.

Can you let us know why these haven’t been included?

Boundary Commission’s Response

*As stated in our report, the boundaries we have proposed aim to reflect community identities and provide for good electoral equality. However, we are open to considering any potential amendments to these boundaries as part of our final recommendations. In terms of a parish review, we have to proposed district ward boundaries which reflect parish boundaries, or which take in to account the rules regarding parish wards, as they currently are. We could propose alternative boundaries in unparished areas subject to evidence received. Alternatively boundaries that are coterminous with parish boundaries could be modified by a related alteration.*

Examples of this are to the southern boundary of Farington West where the boundary used to follow a watercourse which no longer exists and the council has attempted to follow a more identifiable boundary. The second example is to the northern boundary of Farington East where the boundary currently deviates from Farington Road and Lostock Lane and following both roads would create a stronger boundary.

Can you let us know why these haven’t been included?

(2) Eastern

Coupe Green & Gregson Lane

We are not sure why you have moved Walton Summit from Bamber Bridge East to Coupe Green and Gregson Lane. The number of electorate is only very small, none of which has a huge link to either ward. It moves both figures further away from 100%.

Can you give us an explanation of these proposals?

Boundary Commission’s Response

*This area was included in Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward in order to utilise the strong boundary of the M6. This is our proposed boundary as part of our draft.*
recommendations – we welcome evidence on whether this boundary best reflects the statutory criteria during consultation on the draft recommendations.

(4) Western Parishes

Longton and Hutton West

You have moved half of Ratten Lane from New Longton and Hutton East to Longton and Hutton West. As a result both electorate figures are further from the 100% and a road is split between two wards.

Can you give us an explanation of these proposals?

Boundary Commission’s Response

As stated in our report, we used our proposed Ratten Lane boundary as we felt it was more identifiable, and would mean that Ratten Lane was part of the ward with the properties immediately adjacent to it. Again, we welcome evidence on whether this proposal or an alternative provides for the best balance between the statutory criteria.

(5) Warding Pattern

We understood that any combination of warding pattern of 1, 2, or 3, Member Wards was acceptable but you have not accepted any of the Council’s single member Wards.

Can you explain why?

Boundary Commission’s Response

We do not have a policy of rejecting single-member wards, however, we considered that, in the cases where the Council proposed single-member wards that the two- or three-member wards we used instead would provide a better balance of our statutory criteria.

(6) Parish Electoral Arrangements

Farington Parish Council

You propose three wards Farington Central 3 Members, Farington East 2 Members, Farington West 3 Members. However Farington West appears to have the smallest electorate.

Can you give us an explanation of these proposals?

Boundary Commission’s Response

You are correct to say that Farington West parish ward has the smallest electorate of the three proposed parish wards. The parish wards for Farington could be modified as part of our final recommendations report. As part of the consultation on the draft recommendations we welcome views on both the borough proposals and parish warding proposals.
SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting of the Boundary Committee held at 4.15 p.m. on Monday 4th November, 2013 in the Wheel 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)

Public Attendance:-

One

Other Members and Officers:-

Councillors M Green, M Tomlinson, Chief Executive (Mike Nuttall) and Director of Corporate Governance (Maureen Wood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minute No.</th>
<th>Description/Resolution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Apologies for Absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No apologies for absence were received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Declarations of Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There were no declarations of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Minutes of the Last Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RESOLVED (unanimously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 22nd October, 2013 be signed as a correct record</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25 **Electoral Review Of Western Parishes.**

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Western Parishes.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commissions proposals for Western Parishes which were substantially in line with the Council’s submission with exception of the area around Ratten Lane, Hutton. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Commission’s proposals were not as electorally balanced as the Council’s submission the rationale behind the proposal was understood and it was therefore proposed that the Commission’s proposals be accepted.

Resolved (Unanimously)

That the Boundary Commissions proposals in respect of Western Parishes be accepted.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards names in Western Parishes

The Chairman sought the Committees views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Western Parishes area and with the exception of the proposed name of Hoole for Much Hoole and Little Hoole the names were agreed.

In view of the fact that the ward has been known for some time as Little Hoole and Much Hoole and comprised the two separate parishes of Little Hoole and Much Hoole the Ward should retain its name of Little Hoole and Much Hoole.

Resolved (Unanimously)

That the Boundary Commissions proposed names in respect of Longton and Hutton West and New Longton and Hutton East be agreed, but that Hoole be named Little Hoole and Much Hoole.

26 **Electoral Review Of Central.**

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Central.

The Chairman referred to Boundary Commissions proposals for Central and sought the views of the Committee.

Concern was expressed at the Commission’s proposals for the north part of Lostock Hall which didn’t address the issues identified in the Council’s submission. This concerned the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way which was only accessed off The Cawsey and had no direct link with Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate. Once The Cawsey was completed it would provide a link through to Walton-le-Dale West.

Concern was also expressed that the area around Todd Lane North had been
included in Walton-le-Dale West but that in reality they were part of the Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate community and it was therefore proposed that the Commission be recommended to change these boundaries to reflect these concerns.

Resolved (Unanimously)

That the Boundary Commissions proposals in respect of Farington East and Farington West be accepted, subject to the comments outlined within Leyland (minute 29). However, in respect of the Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate Ward, the Commission be requested to amend the northern boundary to address the issues highlighted above.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards names in Central.

The Chairman sought the Committees views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Central area and it was suggested that Lostock Hall should be named Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate to reflect the two communities.

Resolved (Unanimously)

That the Boundary Commissions proposed names in respect of Farington East and West be accepted but that the Lostock Hall Ward be named Lostock Hal and Tardy Gate.

27  

Electoral Review Of Penwortham.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Penwortham.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commissions proposals for Penwortham and sought the views of the Committee.

Generally the Committee accepted the proposals put forward by the Commission however some members expressed concern that the Council’s proposals for a single member ward for Kingsfold had not been accepted bearing in mind the distinct separate communities that Kingsfold and Middleforth represented.

However, other members supported the Commission’s proposals for a three member Middleforth ward.

Resolved (Unanimously)

That the Boundary Commission’s proposals in respect of the wards in Penwortham with the exception of Middleforth be accepted.

Resolved (Yes 7 No 3)

That the Boundary Commission’s proposals in respect of Middleforth be rejected and the Commission be recommended to split Middleforth into a 1
member (Kingsfold) ward and a 2 member (Middleforth) ward in accordance with the Council’s original submission.

**b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards names in Penwortham**

The Chairman sought the Committee’s views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Penwortham area.

Members expressed the general acceptance of the proposed names however there was a suggestion that the ward names be Penwortham North, East, South and West. However the possibility of confusion with County Divisions was expressed against this suggestion.

Resolved (unanimously)

That the Boundary Commission’s proposed names in respect of Penwortham be accepted.

Resolved (Yes 7 No 3)

That in the event that the Commission accept the splitting of Middleforth the Boundary Commission be recommended to name the split Middleforth ward, Kingsfold and Middleforth.

---

**Electoral Review Of Eastern.**

**a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Eastern.**

The Chairman referred to Boundary Commissions proposals for Eastern and it was brought to the attention of the Committee that there was an error in the Commission’s figure for the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward where a large number of existing properties and new development had been omitted. This effectively meant that the Council’s original submissions for Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West provided better electoral equality and which was very close to that submitted by the Labour group.

In view of the proposed change to Walton-le-Dale West referred to in Minute 26 above it would be necessary to look in more detail at the boundary between the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le Dale East.

Resolved (Unanimously)

1. That the Boundary Commission be informed that the Council believes its original submission for the Wards of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East and Bamber Bridge West provided better electoral equality and should be adopted.
2. That the Ward of Samlesbury and Walton be accepted

3. That Members and officers agree a revised boundary of the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le-Dale East for submission to the Council meeting on 20 November 2013.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards names in Eastern.

The Chairman sought the Committees views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Eastern area.

Members expressed their agreement to the proposed names of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West, Samlesbury and Walton and Walton-le-Dale West. However there was a disagreement on Walton-le-Dale East which some members thought should more correctly be named Bamber Bridge North as previously.

Resolved (unanimously)

That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West, Samlesbury and Walton and Walton-le-Dale West be accepted.

Resolved (Yes 6 No 4)

That the Boundary Commission’s proposed name in respect of Walton-le-Dale East be accepted.

Electoral Review Of Leyland.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Leyland.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commissions proposals for Leyland and sought the views of the Committee.

The Committee noted the Commissions reluctance to accept the Council’s submission for Buckshaw Village that it was a special case and would be best served as a single member ward. By merging Buckshaw with the Worden area the other wards proposed by the Commission where generally acceptable.

However, some Members considered that the Commission’s proposals for the Earnshaw Bridge Ward was a somewhat odd shape and were two distinct communities and would be more suited to be split into two single member wards. The southern boundary between Earnshaw Bridge and the proposed Wade Hall Ward being adjusted slightly in the north and by following Leyland Lane to the borough boundary in the south.

Reference was also made to the northern boundary of the Leyland area and
that of Farington East where the Council’s submission and the Labour Group’s submission were substantially the same but which the Commission had not accepted.

Resolved (Unanimously)

1. That the Boundary Commission’s proposals in respect of the wards in Leyland with the exception of Earnshaw Bridge and its boundary with Wade Hall be accepted.

2. That Members and officers agree a revised boundary of the proposed Farington East / Turpin Green for submission to the Council meeting on 20 November 2013.

Resolved (Yes 6 No 4)

That the Boundary Commission’s proposals in respect of Earnshaw Bridge be rejected and the Commission be recommended to split Earnshaw Bridge into two 1 member wards adjusting the boundary as set out above.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards names in Leyland.

The Chairman sought the Committees views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Leyland area. There was a degree of discussion on the name for the various wards. Members were generally supportive of Broadfield and Buckshaw and Worden, but were concerned about some of the others. In particular Wade Hall which didn’t reflect the ward and which would be better named Seven Stars. Similarly Bannister Brook as the logical centre of Leyland would be better named Leyland Central and Moss Side would be more descriptively named Moss Side and Midge Hall.

Less agreement was reached on suggestions of St Ambrose for Turpin Green and Lostock for Earnshaw Bridge.

Resolved (Unanimously)

1. That the Boundary Commission’s proposed names in respect of Broadfield and Buckshaw and Worden be accepted.

2. That the Boundary Commission’s proposed names in respect of Moss Side, Wade Hall, and Bannister Brook be rejected and substituted by Moss Side and Midge Hall, Seven Stars and Leyland Central respectively.

Resolved (Yes 6 No 4)

1. That the Boundary Commission’s proposed names in respect of
Earnshaw Bridge be accepted.

2. That in the event that the Commission accept the splitting of Earnshaw Bridge the Boundary Commission be recommended to name the split Earnshaw Bridge ward, Moss Side South East and Earnshaw Bridge

3. That the Boundary Commission’s proposed names in respect of Turpin Green, be rejected and substituted by St Ambrose.

30 Forthcoming Meetings

Members agreed that there was no need for further meetings at this stage.

The meeting closed at 5.03pm.

................................................................. Chairman
Extract from the minutes of the Council meeting held on Wednesday 20th November

“SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL

Meeting held at 6.00pm on Wednesday, 20th November, 2013 in Shield Room, Civic Centre, West Paddock, Leyland, PR25 1DH

Present:-

Councillor Mrs D Gardner (in the chair)

Councillors Ms Bell, S Bennett, Clark, Coulton, Crook, Evans, Forrest, Foster, M Gardner, Mrs Mary Green, Michael Green, Hamman, Hanson, Harrison, Hesketh, Heyworth, Higgins, Mrs Hothersall, Howarth, Hughes, K Jones, Mrs S Jones, Kelly, Marsh, Martin, Mrs Mort, Mullineaux, Nelson, Mrs Noblet, O'Hare, Ogilvie, Otter, Pimblett, Prynn, Rainsbury, Mrs M Smith, Smith, Stettner, Suthers, Titherington, C Tomlinson, M Tomlinson, Miss Walker, Walton, Mrs Woollard and Yates

Report of the Boundary Committee

The Leader presented the report of the Boundary Committee meetings held on 22 October and 4 November. The report was seconded.

The Leader commented that since the 4 November meeting some further work had been carried out relating to recommendation 3 (proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le-Dale East wards) and members of her group were happy but she did not know whether or not Councillor Watts still had some concerns.

Councillor M Tomlinson said that the Labour group’s submission had now been sent off and it was largely in line with many of the suggestions from the Boundary Commission. He paid tribute to the hours of work undertaken by Councillors Martin and Watts.

There was some discussion from all sides of the chamber about particular ward names and about the appropriateness or otherwise of single-member wards.

RESOLVED that:

1) Unanimous
   The recommendations of the Boundary Committee that all members of the committee present agreed be approved;

2) YES – 28, NO – 20, ABSTENTION – 0
   The recommendations of the Boundary Committee that the majority of members of the committee agreed be approved;

3) YES – 28, NO – 20, ABSTENTION – 0
   The revised boundary of the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le-Dale East wards be agreed;

4) Unanimous
   The revised boundaries of the proposed Farington East/Turpin Green wards be agreed, and

5) Unanimous
   The Chief Executive in consultation with the chairman of the Boundary Committee be authorised to finalise the Council’s response to the Local Government Boundary Commission’s Draft Recommendations for New Electoral Arrangements for South Ribble

Appendix D
26 Kingshaven Drive  
Penwortham  
Preston  
PR1 9BS

For the attention of the Boundaries Commissioners  
c/o Demographic Services  
South Ribble Borough Council  
Civic Centre  
West Paddock  
Leyland  
Lancashire  
PR25 1DH

13th December 2013

Dear Sirs

PROPOSED BOUNDARY CHANGES IN PENWORTHAM

I understand that it is proposed to amalgamate the Middleforth and Kingsfold wards of Penwortham into a single ward on the basis that Middleforth and Kingsfold are one community. I must strenuously disagree.

Middleforth is the oldest area of Penwortham with a rich history and consists of a well-established community of mainly older and in the main privately owned properties whereas Kingsfold consists to a great extent of 1940’s and 50’s social housing.

Emphasising the difference in the communities is the fact that Kingsfold is the only area of Penwortham which is identified on Lancashire County Council’s street signs, surely indicating that it is a totally separate community to Middleforth.

Whilst I live in Charnock Ward, my home is only metres from the Kingsfold boundary and I assure you that it is not the same community as Middleforth.

Yours sincerely

Joan M. Burrows  
Councillor  
Penwortham Town Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Properties and electorate</th>
<th>Properties</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Prop Dev</th>
<th>Prop Elec</th>
<th>Total Prop</th>
<th>Total Elec</th>
<th>Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA1</strong></td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>3039</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>3039</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>667.8</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3706.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-50 98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA2</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0 106.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CB1</strong></td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>2121.6</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>4274.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-35 98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CB2</strong></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>690.6</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>699.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+15 96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC1</strong></td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1932.1</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3909.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+125 97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CC2</strong></td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1973.8</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>3891.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-77 96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSD1</strong></td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>1996.2</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3992.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0 104.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSD2</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>250.3</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-30 98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA1</strong></td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>3226.2</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>3580.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-61 99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA2</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADFIELD</strong></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3724</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>3908.0</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3902.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-14 99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUCKSHAW &amp; WORDEN</strong></td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1646.8</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1936.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-35 97.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEYLAND CENTRAL</strong></td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>3854</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>3854</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>3360.2</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>3580.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-13 99.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST AMBROSE</strong></td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>2278</td>
<td>1352</td>
<td>2278.0</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>3084.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-12 99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOSS SIDE &amp; MIDGE HALL</strong></td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1026</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1932.1</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3909.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+125 97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EARNSHAW BRIDGE</strong></td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>1996.2</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>3891.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-77 96.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUNKIRK</strong></td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1508.5</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>1918.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+14 99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEVEN STARS</strong></td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>2026.9</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>2380.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-13 98.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON-LE-DALE WEST</strong></td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>3942.4</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>3892.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-17 98.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WALTON-LE-DALE EAST</strong></td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1481.0</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1481.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAMBER BRIDGE WEST</strong></td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>1475</td>
<td>2507.0</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>3024.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-27 98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOWICK &amp; PRIORY</strong></td>
<td>587</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>700.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BROADDOAK</strong></td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>3994</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>3994.0</td>
<td>2156</td>
<td>3994.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KINGSFOLD</strong></td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1890.0</td>
<td>1169</td>
<td>1890.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLEFORTH</strong></td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1733.0</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1733.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHARNOCK</strong></td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1315.0</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>1315.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BAMBER BRIDGE EAST</strong></td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>2262.0</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>2262.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUPE GREEN &amp; GREGSON LANE</strong></td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAMLESBURY AND WALTON</strong></td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1051.0</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1051.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+0 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONGTON AND HUTTON WEST</strong></td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW LONGTON &amp; HUTTON EAST</strong></td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LITTLE HOOLE &amp; MUCH HOOLE</strong></td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>