

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Manchester

February 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

Applications for reproduction should be made to: Her Majesty's Stationery Office Copyright Unit.

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by The Electoral Commission with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright.

Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Licence Number: GD 03114G.

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	13
2 Current electoral arrangements	15
3 Submissions received	19
4 Analysis and draft recommendations	21
5 What happens next?	33
Appendices	
A Draft recommendations for Manchester: Detailed mapping	35
B Code of practice on written consultation	37

What is The Boundary Committee for England?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No. 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)
Professor Michael Clarke CBE
Robin Gray
Joan Jones CBE
Ann M Kelly
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish councils.

Summary

We began a review of the electoral arrangements for Manchester on 14 May 2002.

- **This report summarises the submissions we received during the first stage of the review, and makes draft recommendations for change.**

We found that the current arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Manchester:

- **in 19 of the 33 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city and 10 wards vary by more than 20% from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 22 wards and by more than 20% in 12 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 64-65) are that:

- **Manchester City Council should have 96 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 32 wards, instead of 33 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 32 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries;**

The purpose of these proposals is to ensure that, in future, each city councillor represents approximately the same number of electors, bearing in mind local circumstances.

- **In 27 of the proposed 32 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the city average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10% from the average for the city in 2006.**

This report sets out our draft recommendations on which comments are invited.

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 25 February 2003. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission which will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**
- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 22 April 2003:

**Team Leader
Manchester Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Table 1: Draft recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1	Ardwick	3	Part of Ardwick ward; part of Longsight ward; part of Rusholme ward	Map 2
2	Baguley	3	Part of Baguley ward; part of Brooklands ward	Map 3
3	Bradford	3	Part of Beswick & Clayton ward; Bradford ward	Maps 1 and 2
4	Brooklands	3	Part of Baguley ward; part of Brooklands ward; part of Northenden ward	Maps 2 and 3
5	Burnage	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Burnage ward)	Map 2
6	Charlestown	3	Part of Charlestown ward; part of Lightbowne ward; part of Moston ward	Map 1
7	Cheetham	3	Cheetham ward; part of Crumpsall ward; part of Harpurhey ward	Map 1
8	Chorlton	3	Part of Chorlton ward; part of Whalley Range ward	Map 2
9	Chorlton Park	3	Part of Barlow Moor ward; part of Chorlton ward; part of Old Moat ward	Map 2
10	City Centre	3	Part of Central ward	Maps 1 and 2
11	Clayton Bridge	3	Part of Beswick & Clayton ward; part of Central ward; part of Newton Heath ward	Map 1
12	Crumpsall	3	Part of Charlestown ward; part of Crumpsall ward	Map 1
13	Didsbury East	3	Part of Didsbury ward; part of Withington ward	Maps 1 and 2
14	Didsbury West	3	Part of Barlow Moor ward; part of Didsbury ward; part of Old Moat ward	Maps 1 and 2
15	Fallowfield	3	Part of Fallowfield ward; part of Moss Side ward	Map 2
16	Gorton North	3	Part of Ardwick ward; part of Gorton North ward; part of Gorton South ward; part of Longsight ward	Map 2
17	Gorton South	3	Part of Gorton North ward; part of Gorton South ward; part of Levenshulme ward	Map 2
18	Harpurhey	3	Part of Charlestown ward; part of Harpurhey ward; part of Lightbowne ward	Map 1
19	Higher Blackley	3	Part of Blackley ward; part of Charlestown ward; part of Crumpsall ward	Map 1
20	Hulme	3	Part of Hulme ward	Map 2
21	Levenshulme	3	Part of Levenshulme ward; part of Rusholme ward	Map 2
22	Longsight	3	Part of Gorton South ward; part of Longsight ward	Map 2
23	Moss Side	3	Part of Fallowfield ward; part of Hulme ward; part of Moss Side ward	Map 2
24	Moston	3	Part of Lightbowne ward; part of Moston ward	Map 1
25	Northenden	3	Part of Benchill ward; part of Northenden ward; part of Sharston ward	Maps 2 and 3

26	Newton Heath	3	Part of Newton Heath ward; part of Central ward	Map 1
27	Old Moat	3	Part of Old Moat ward	Map 2
28	Rusholme	3	Part of Rusholme ward	Map 2
29	Sharston	3	Part of Benchill ward; part of Sharston ward	Map 3
30	Whalley Range	3	Part of Fallowfield ward; part of Moss Side ward; part of Whalley Range ward	Map 2
31	Withington	3	Part of Old Moat ward; part of Withington ward	Map 2
32	Woodhouse Park	3	Part of Benchill ward; part of Sharston ward; Woodhouse Park ward	Map 3

Notes:

- 1) *Ringway is the only parish in the city.*
- 2) *The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.*

Table 2: Draft recommendations for Manchester

	Ward name	No. of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Ardwick	3	10,522	3,507	7	10,620	3,540	6
2	Baguley	3	10,057	3,352	2	9,964	3,321	-1
3	Bradford	3	8,826	2,942	-10	9,616	3,205	-4
4	Brooklands	3	9,894	3,298	0	10,180	3,393	1
5	Burnage	3	10,008	3,336	2	9,742	3,247	-3
6	Charlestown	3	9,639	3,213	-2	9,562	3,187	-5
7	Cheetham	3	9,499	3,166	-4	9,478	3,159	-6
8	Chorlton	3	10,281	3,427	4	9,973	3,324	-1
9	Chorlton Park	3	9,323	3,108	-5	10,304	3,435	2
10	City Centre	3	5,471	1,824	-44	11,065	3,688	10
11	Clayton Bridge	3	7,821	2,607	-21	9,488	3,163	-6
12	Crumpsall	3	9,849	3,283	0	9,957	3,319	-1
13	Didsbury East	3	10,268	3,423	4	10,023	3,341	0
14	Didsbury West	3	10,087	3,362	2	10,101	3,367	0
15	Fallowfield	3	10,222	3,407	4	10,223	3,408	2
16	Gorton North	3	10,603	3,534	8	10,195	3,398	1
17	Gorton South	3	10,941	3,647	11	10,733	3,578	7
18	Harpurhey	3	11,446	3,815	16	10,287	3,429	2
19	Higher Blackley	3	10,210	3,403	4	9,812	3,271	-2
20	Hulme	3	7,962	2,654	-19	10,024	3,341	0
21	Levenshulme	3	10,578	3,526	7	10,361	3,454	3
22	Longsight	3	10,278	3,426	4	9,928	3,309	-1
23	Moss Side	3	10,171	3,390	3	10,278	3,426	2
24	Moston	3	10,408	3,469	6	10,114	3,371	1
25	Newton Heath	3	10,425	3,475	6	9,779	3,260	-3
26	Northenden	3	10,136	3,379	3	9,881	3,294	-2

27	Old Moat	3	10,496	3,499	7	10,254	3,418	2
28	Rusholme	3	9,940	3,313	1	10,200	3,400	1
29	Sharston	3	9,941	3,314	1	9,996	3,332	-1
30	Whalley Range	3	10,117	3,372	3	10,169	3,390	1
31	Withington	3	10,116	3,372	3	9,916	3,305	-1
32	Woodhouse Park	3	9,685	3,228	-2	9,676	3,225	-4
	Totals	96	315,220	-	-	321,899	-	-
	Average	-	-	3,284	-	-	3,353	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Manchester City Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 Introduction

1 This report contains our proposals for the electoral arrangements for the city of Manchester, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 10 metropolitan boroughs in Greater Manchester as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. The programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Manchester. Manchester's last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1980 (Report no. 393).

3 In carrying out these metropolitan reviews we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Manchester is being conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reviews* (Published by the EC in July 2002). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations to The Electoral Commission on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish councils in the city.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, as far as possible, equal representation across the city as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10% in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that, whatever council size interested parties may propose to us, they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972, there is no limit on the number of councillors which can be returned from each metropolitan borough/city ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan borough/city wards currently return three councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 The review is in four stages (see Table 3).

Table 3: Stages of the review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to us
Two	Our analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to The Electoral Commission

10 Stage One began on 14 May 2002, when we wrote to Manchester City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Greater Manchester Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Greater Manchester Local Councils Association, the parish council in the city, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, Members of the European Parliament for the North West Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Manchester City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 16 September 2002.

11 At Stage Two we considered all the submissions received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

12 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 25 February 2003 and will end on 22 April 2003, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

13 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to modify them, and submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission. It will then be for it to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If The Electoral Commission accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, it will make an Order. The Electoral Commission will determine when any changes come into effect

2 Current electoral arrangements

14 The city of Manchester, as a regional capital, stands at the centre of the North West, an area with seven million residents. The city grew from the bedrock of innovation and manufacturing strength, dating back to the industrial revolution and built on the inventions of Crompton's Mule and Arkwright's Spinning Jenny, to lead the world in textiles. The decline in the manufacturing industry led to a decline in the fortunes of the city and region. However, over the last 10 years Manchester has re-emerged as a vibrant, modern and successful regional capital and a concerted programme of regeneration has seen the city transformed.

15 The city contains only one parish, that of Ringway, which was included within the city in 1974 as part of local government reorganisation and thus brought Manchester International Airport within the boundary of a single local authority.

16 The electorate of the city is 315,220 (December 2001). The Council presently has 99 members who are elected from 33 wards. All wards are three-member wards.

17 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,184 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 3,252 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 19 of the 33 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average, 10 wards by more than 20% and two wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Longsight ward where the councillor represents 40% more electors than the city average.

18 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the city average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

Map 1: Existing wards in Manchester

Table 4: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward name	No. of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Ardwick	3	8,396	2,799	-12	7,531	2,510	-23
2	Baguley	3	8,684	2,895	-9	8,548	2,849	-12
3	Barlow Moor	3	10,631	3,544	11	11,432	3,811	17
4	Benchill	3	7,046	2,349	-26	6,862	2,287	-30
5	Beswick & Clayton	3	6,976	2,325	-27	7,155	2,385	-27
6	Blackley	3	8,231	2,744	-14	7,931	2,644	-19
7	Bradford	3	6,863	2,288	-28	7,809	2,603	-20
8	Brooklands	3	8,489	2,830	-11	8,740	2,913	-10
9	Burnage	3	10,008	3,336	5	9,781	3,260	0
10	Central	3	10,530	3,510	10	17,305	5,768	77
11	Charlestown	3	8,799	2,933	-8	9,187	3,062	-6
12	Cheetham	3	9,278	3,093	-3	9,341	3,114	-4
13	Chorlton	3	11,752	3,917	23	11,488	3,829	18
14	Crumpsall	3	9,354	3,118	-2	9,127	3,042	-6
15	Didsbury	3	11,601	3,867	21	11,443	3,814	17
16	Fallowfield	3	11,837	3,946	24	12,132	4,044	24
17	Gorton North	3	9,766	3,255	2	9,411	3,137	-4
18	Gorton South	3	8,828	2,943	-8	8,583	2,861	-12
19	Harpurhey	3	7,687	2,562	-20	7,219	2,406	-26
20	Hulme	3	9,101	3,034	-5	11,252	3,751	15
21	Levenshulme	3	10,245	3,415	7	10,235	3,412	5
22	Lightbowne	3	8,211	2,737	-14	7,014	2,338	-28
23	Longsight	3	13,410	4,470	40	13,073	4,358	34
24	Moss Side	3	8,778	2,926	-8	8,748	2,916	-10
25	Moston	3	9,491	3,164	-1	9,655	3,218	-1
26	Newton Heath	3	8,174	2,725	-14	7,833	2,611	-20
27	Northenden	3	9,825	3,275	3	9,707	3,236	0
28	Old Moat	3	12,776	4,259	34	12,885	4,295	32
29	Rusholme	3	12,217	4,072	28	12,438	4,146	28
30	Sharston	3	7,604	2,535	-20	7,744	2,581	-21
31	Whalley Range	3	10,238	3,413	7	10,040	3,347	3
32	Withington	3	12,329	4,110	29	12,105	4,035	24
33	Woodhouse Park	3	8,065	2,688	-16	8,145	2,715	-17
	Totals	99	315,220	-	-	321,899	-	-
	Average	-	-	3,184	-	-	3,252	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Manchester City Council.*

Note: *The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Bradford ward were relatively over-represented by 28%, while electors in Longsight ward were relatively under-represented by 40%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

3 Submissions received

19 At the start of the review members of the public and other interested parties were invited to write to The Boundary Committee giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Manchester City Council and its constituent parish council.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from The Boundary Committee visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 17 representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council and the Liberal Democrat Group on Manchester City Council & the City of Manchester Liberal Democrats, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council.

Manchester City Council

21 The City Council proposed a council of 96 members, three fewer than at present, serving 32 wards, one fewer than the existing 33. Under the City Council's proposals only one ward would vary by more than 10% by 2006.

The Liberal Democrat Group on Manchester City Council & the City of Manchester Liberal Democrats

22 The Liberal Democrat Group on Manchester City Council & the City of Manchester Liberal Democrats ('the Liberal Democrats') proposed a council of 81 members, 18 fewer than at present, serving 27 wards, six fewer than at present. Under their proposals no ward would vary by more than 10% by 2006.

Members of Parliament

23 Paul Goggins MP supported the City Council's proposals for the city.

Other representations

24 A further 14 representations were received from five local political parties and residents groups, two city councillors and seven local residents. The Manchester Local Government Committee supported the City Council's proposals for the city. Wythenshawe & Sale East Conservative Association objected to the City Council's proposals in the south of the city and proposed a number of alternatives. Abbey Hey Residents Association and Gorton Community Forum made a number of proposals for the Gorton area. Newton Heath Partnership objected to the City Council's proposals in the Newton Heath area and proposed that the current ward be retained. Councillor Lyons submitted proposals for the Blackley area. Councillor O'Connor objected to the proposals of the City Council in the Newton Heath area and forwarded a 500-signature petition. Four local residents objected to the proposals for the Newton Heath area while three local residents objected to proposals in the Didsbury area.

4 Analysis and draft recommendations

25 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Manchester and welcome comments from all those interested relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, ward names, and parish council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

26 As described earlier, the prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Manchester is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended): the need to secure effective and convenient local government; reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and secure the matters referred to in paragraph 3(2)(a) of Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (equality of representation). Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

27 In relation to Schedule 11, our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on existing electorate figures, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place over the next five years. We must also have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

28 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which results in exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

29 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for an authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable. However, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be minimised, the aim of electoral equality should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should make electoral equality their starting point, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. Five-year forecasts of changes in electorate must also be considered and we would aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over this five-year period.

Electorate forecasts

30 Since 1975 there has been a 15% decrease in the electorate of Manchester city. Development instigated by regeneration has resulted in a shift of electors towards the regenerated areas, with the knock-on effect of many wards being substantially under-represented. The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 2% from 315,220 to 321,899 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in the city centre area, although a significant amount is also expected in Hulme ward. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates.

31 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered the City Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council size

32 Manchester City Council presently has 99 members. The City Council proposed a council of 96 members, a reduction of three. It argued that there are critical factors that shape the current

and future size of the Council and that they are determined by the modernisation of the Council's decision-making structures and processes; strategic and community leadership; the City's role as the regional capital of the North West; and the development and implementation of the Manchester Community Strategy. It provided details of the responsibilities of members on the Council and argued that its new constitutional arrangements have demanded very high levels of political leadership from Executive members; a greater degree of challenge from Scrutiny members and a strengthened capacity for policy development; enhanced levels of stewardship from those members responsible for regulatory and statutory functions; and increased cross-party working. It argued further that the ward co-ordination process in Manchester has intensified the role of members as elected local representatives, that their active involvement was fundamental to its future success and that a significant reduction in the number of elected representatives would limit its effectiveness. It stated that the strategic leadership and advocacy role of elected members and the mixture of cultures, customs and lifestyles in the city generate an additional level of complexity and representation. It also stated that an Independent Remuneration Panel which advises the council on allowances payable to members concluded that, although there had been a reduction in the time spent in meetings this had been more than compensated for by an increase in work at a community level.

33 The Liberal Democrats proposed a council size of 81, a reduction of 18 councillors. They compared the responsibilities of councillors with regard to their commitments to a variety of council meetings under the former traditional committee system and concluded that, under this system, councillors were able to attend an average of 36 meetings per year in addition to their duties to their constituents, sub-committee attendance and appointment panel attendance. In comparison, they argued that under the new management arrangements, Executive members would attend an average of 27 meetings a year and non-executive members somewhere in the range of 17 to 27. It concluded that 67 councillors could service the committee structure but proposed an additional 14 councillors to give a 36% cushion in the number of non-executive councillors.

34 We have carefully considered the evidence provided at Stage One in respect of the most appropriate council size for Manchester. We note that the primary argument put forward by the Liberal Democrats was that under the new management structures fewer councillors were needed to fulfil the council's obligations in comparison with the former traditional committee system. However, we also note the City Council's assertion that the representational role of councillors has significantly changed and that they play a key strategic role in the city. Given the wide responsibilities of councillors we were not sufficiently convinced by the Liberal Democrats' argumentation for a reduction in council size of 18 councillors. Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 96 members.

Electoral arrangements

35 Given our proposal to adopt the City Council's proposals for a council size of 96 and in view of the degree of consensus behind elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have based our recommendations on the City Council's scheme. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. Unfortunately, while we acknowledge that there is much to recommend the warding pattern put forward by the Liberal Democrats, given the difference in proposed council size between the schemes of the City Council and the Liberal Democrats' we have been unable to recommend any of the Liberal Democrats' proposals. However, we have noted objections to the City Council's proposals in a number of areas and where possible have sought to improve electoral equality further and better improve local community identities and interests. We have decided to move away from the City Council's proposals in a number of areas across the city. We propose boundary amendments to its proposals in the Northenden, Moss

Side/Fallowfield, Longsight/Ardwick, Cheetham/Harpurhey and Moston/Charlestown areas and propose reconfiguring its proposals in the central area of the city. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) Baguley, Benchill, Brooklands, Northenden, Sharston and Woodhouse Park wards;
- b) Ardwick, Barlow Moor, Burnage, Chorlton, Didsbury, Fallowfield, Gorton North, Gorton South, Hulme, Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley Range and Withington wards;
- c) Beswick & Clayton, Bradford, Central and Newton Heath wards;
- d) Blackley, Charlestown, Cheetham, Crumpsall, Harpurhey, Lightbowne and Moston wards.

36 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Baguley, Benchill, Brooklands, Northenden, Sharston and Woodhouse Park wards

37 These six wards are situated in the south of the city. The wards of Baguley, Benchill, Brooklands, Northenden and Sharston are all urban in nature and are unparished. Woodhouse Park ward comprises the city's only parish, Ringway, and an unparished area to its north. Under the existing arrangements Baguley, Benchill, Brooklands, Northenden, Sharston and Woodhouse Park wards currently have 9% fewer, 26% fewer, 11% fewer, 3% more, 20% fewer and 16% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (12% fewer, 30% fewer, 10% fewer, equal to, 21% fewer and 17% fewer in 2006).

38 At Stage One the City Council proposed that the area be made up of five wards. It proposed that the area to the north of Ledson Road and to the west of Southmoor Road in the current Baguley ward be transferred to its proposed Brooklands ward while the area to the east of Southmoor and Moor Road to the north of and including Bideford Drive and Parkwood Road be transferred from the current Brooklands ward to its proposed Baguley ward. In addition it proposed that the area to the west of Orton Road, Fellgate Road and to the west of and including Tipton Drive as far as the M60 be transferred from the current Northenden ward to the proposed Brooklands ward while the area to the east of Wythenshawe Horticultural Centre and Fir Coppice be transferred from the current Brooklands ward to the proposed Northenden ward. Its proposed Northenden ward would also comprise the majority of the current ward and that part of the current Benchill ward to the north of Hollyhedge Road and to the west of Brownley Road. It also proposed that the area to the west of Sharston Road in the current Sharston ward be transferred to its proposed Northenden ward. It proposed that the remainder of the current Benchill and Sharston wards with the exception of the area to the south of Gladeside Road and to the west of Rowlandsway form a new Sharston ward. It proposed that the areas to the south of Gladeside Road and to the west of Rowlandsway be transferred to an enlarged Woodhouse Park ward.

39 Under the City Council's scheme its proposed Baguley, Brooklands, Northenden, Sharston and Woodhouse Park wards would initially have 2% more, equal to, 3% more, 1% more and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (1% fewer, 1% more, 2% fewer, 1% fewer and 4% fewer in 2006).

40 The Liberal Democrats proposed an arrangement of four wards for this area. However, these warding arrangements were based on an overall reduction in council size which are incompatible with our proposals for a council size of 96. While we have given careful consideration to their proposed ward boundaries, it has not proved possible to accommodate any part of their proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. Paul Goggins MP supported the City Council's proposals for the area arguing, that they accurately reflected local communities and dealt with natural boundaries such as the River Mersey and M56 Motorway in

a practical way. Wythenshawe & Sale East Conservative Association objected to the City Council's proposals in this area. It objected to the proposals to divide the Northern Moor area, arguing that there was strong community identity between the Brooklands and Northenden areas. It argued that the Bideford Lane area would be divided from the remainder of the proposed Baguley ward by Altrincham Road and has no common interest with the community on the other side of the road. It also argued that the area currently within Benchill ward that the City Council proposed transferring to its proposed Northenden ward was separate from the remainder of the ward and proposed that polling districts SHA, SHK, SHC and SHJ in the current Sharston ward be transferred instead as they are better in terms of 'accessibility and common interests'. It also proposed that more radical arrangements be created in the area and Wythenshawe North and South or East and West wards be created.

41 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We noted the objections of Wythenshawe & Sale East Conservative Association and their proposal that areas of the current Sharston ward be combined with Northenden rather than areas of the current Benchill ward. However, although we note that these proposals would secure an acceptable level of electoral equality by 2006, we have not been convinced that the links between these areas would any better reflect community ties than under the City Council's proposed Northenden ward. We also note their proposals for the Bideford Lane area and note that the area is currently within the same ward as properties on the southern side of Altrincham Road and have therefore not been convinced that this would better reflect community identity than the proposals of the City Council. We acknowledge that the City Council's proposals in the area are not ideal and have carefully considered alternative configurations for the area. However, we note that the City Council's proposals secure a good level of electoral equality and that the M56 Motorway has been adhered to as a strong boundary between the eastern and western areas where possible and that the River Mersey provides a very strong boundary in the north. We were therefore not minded to breach these boundaries unless necessary and consider that the City Council's proposals would provide for the best balance of the statutory criteria in the area.

42 We therefore propose adopting the majority of the City Council's proposals for the area. However, we propose a minor amendment in order to utilise further the M56 as a boundary. We propose that the boundary between the proposed Brooklands and Northenden wards be extended northwards along the M56 and then westwards along Wythenshawe Road. We also note that this proposal would result in the whole of Wythenshawe Park being contained within a single ward. The electoral variances would be the same as the under the City Council's scheme.

Ardwick, Barlow Moor, Burnage, Chorlton, Didsbury, Fallowfield, Gorton North, Gorton South, Hulme, Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley Range and Withington wards

43 These sixteen wards are located to the south of the city centre area. The wards of Ardwick, Barlow Moor, Burnage, Chorlton, Didsbury, Fallowfield, Gorton North and Gorton South currently have 12% fewer, 11% more, 5% more, 23% more, 21% more, 24% more, 2% more and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (23% fewer, 17% more, equal to, 18% more, 17% more, 24% more, 4% fewer and 12% fewer in 2006).

44 The wards of Hulme, Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley Range and Withington currently have 5% fewer, 7% more, 40% more, 8% fewer, 34% more, 28% more, 7% more and 29% more electors per councillor than the city average (15% more, 5% more, 34% more, 10% fewer, 32% more, 28% more, 3% more and 24% more in 2006).

45 At Stage One the City Council proposed new Didsbury East and Didsbury West wards. Its proposed Didsbury East ward would comprise the area of the current Didsbury ward to the east of Wilmslow Road and to the south of Stenner Lane and the area to the south of Cotton Lane,

Heathside Road and Heyscroft Road in the current Withington ward. Its proposed Didsbury West ward would comprise the remainder of the current Didsbury ward, that part of the current Barlow Moor ward to the east of Princess Road, to the south of Barlow Moor Road and to the east of Burton Road and that part of the current Old Moat ward to the south of Goulden Road and Oak Road. It proposed that the current Burnage ward be maintained on its current boundaries. Its proposed Chorlton Park ward would comprise the remainder of the current Barlow Moor ward, the area of the current Old Moat ward to the west of Princess Road, and that part of the current Chorlton ward to the east of and including Cundiff Road, Hurstville Road and Redland Crescent, to the east of Barlow Moor Lane, and south of Wilbraham Road. It proposed that the remainder of the current Chorlton ward be combined with that part of the current Whalley Range ward to the west of Egerton Road North to form a new Chorlton ward. Its proposed Whalley Range ward would comprise the remainder of the current ward combined with that area of Fallowfield ward to the west of Princess Road, north of Brantingham Road and to the west of Alexandra Road South to the north of Gowan Road and Alexandra Park in the current Moss Side ward.

46 It proposed that the remainder of the current Withington ward be combined with that part of the current Old Moat ward north of Oak Road and east of Palatine Road to form a revised Withington ward, while the remainder of the current Old Moat ward would form a new Old Moat ward. Its proposed Fallowfield ward would comprise the current Fallowfield ward less that area to be transferred to its proposed Whalley Range ward. Its proposed Moss Side ward would comprise the existing Moss Side ward, part of the current Hulme ward to the south of Dilworth Street and east of Lloyd Street North and less the area to be transferred to the proposed Whalley Range ward. Its proposed Hulme ward would comprise the remainder of the current Hulme ward. Its proposed Ardwick ward would comprise the majority of the current Ardwick ward less the area to the east of Pottery Lane which it proposed be transferred to its proposed Gorton North ward. It proposed that it would additionally include the area to the north of Oxford Place in the current Rusholme ward and the areas to the north of Daisy Bank, Richmond Grove, Britnall Avenue and Kirkmanshulme Lane in the current Longsight ward.

47 Its proposed Rusholme ward would comprise the majority of the current Rusholme ward less the area to be transferred to its proposed Ardwick ward and an area to the south of and including Manchester University Athletic Ground and to the south of Kingsway Avenue which it proposed be included within its proposed Levenshulme ward. Its proposed Longsight ward would comprise parts of the current Longsight ward less the area to be transferred to the proposed Ardwick ward and the area to the north of Kirkmanshulme Lane and east of Pink Bank Lane which it proposed be transferred to its proposed Gorton North ward. It also proposed that the properties on Pink Bank Lane and between Woodhill Close and Butterwick Lane in the current Gorton South ward be transferred to its proposed Longsight ward. Its proposed Levenshulme ward would be based on the existing ward subject to the transfer from the current Rusholme ward (previously detailed) and subject to the transfer of the electors to the north of the railway line, Broom Lane and Chapel Street to its proposed Gorton South ward. In addition to the proposals already mentioned, its proposed Gorton South ward would include that part of the existing Gorton North ward to the south of Gorton Lower Reservoir, while electors to the north of Maiden's Bridge, Sunny Brow Park, Haworth Road and Buckley Road would be transferred to its proposed Gorton North ward. The northern boundary of its proposed Gorton North ward would remain unchanged.

48 Under the City Council's scheme its proposed Ardwick, Burnage, Chorlton, Chorlton Park, Didsbury East, Didsbury West, Fallowfield, Gorton North and Gorton South wards would initially have 2% more, 2% more, 4% more, 5% fewer, 4% more, 2% more, 6% more, 8% more and 11% more electors per councillor than the city average (1% more, 3% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% more, equal to, equal to, 4% more, 1% more and 7% more in 2006).

49 The City Council's proposed Hulme, Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley Range and Withington wards would initially have 19% fewer, 7% more, 9%

more, 1% more, 7% more, 1% more, 3% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the city average (equal to, 3% more, 3% more, equal to, 2% more, 1% more, 1% more and 1% fewer in 2006).

50 The Liberal Democrats proposed a pattern of 15 wards for this area. However, these warding arrangements were based on an overall reduction in council size which are incompatible with our proposals for a council size of 96. Abbey Hey Residents Association argued that Gorton North ward would be best served by a boundary running along Hyde Road and that its northern boundary should take in the properties north of the Manchester-Leeds railway line, run to, and then along Alan Turing Way to its junction with Wenlock Way and take in the estate on either side of Wenlock Way and Hyde Road. It argued that the Gorton North area has community ties with the Openshaw area and that there would be many advantages to placing the areas in the same ward. It also argued that Hyde Road formed a barrier with the area to the south. Gorton Community Forum proposed that the current Gorton North and Gorton South wards be maintained, arguing that the A57 is a dividing line between the two communities. It further proposed that, under a 31-ward pattern for the city, this could be achieved by splitting the current Benchill and Beswick & Clayton wards. Three local residents objected to the City Council's proposed Chorlton Park and Didsbury West wards, arguing that they did not want to be part of a Chorlton ward.

51 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note the proposals for the Gorton area from Abbey Hey Residents Association and Gorton Community Forum. However, while we have some sympathy with their views, we note that their proposals would greatly impact across the city and that we must consider the appropriate warding pattern for the area as a whole. We have also carefully considered the objections to the City Council's proposals in the Didsbury area. However, in order to secure improved levels of electoral equality in the area, it has not been possible to accommodate these views. Therefore we propose adopting the City Council's proposals in the area subject to a number of boundary amendments in order to improve community identity. We propose a boundary amendment between the proposed Fallowfield and Moss Side wards in order to better reflect community identity in the area. We propose that the boundary be amended to run north to the rear of the properties on Bidston Avenue, then proceed west to the south of the properties on Horton Road and then north along Lloyd Street South. We also propose a boundary amendment between the proposed Ardwick and Longsight wards to better reflect the local community and provide for a more identifiable boundary in the area. We propose that the boundary be amended so that it run along the centre of Kirkmanshulme.

52 Under our draft proposals the proposed Ardwick, Burnage, Chorlton, Chorlton Park, Didsbury East, Didsbury West, Fallowfield, Gorton North and Gorton South wards would initially have 7% more, 2% more, 4% more, 5% fewer, 4% more, 2% more, 4% more, 8% more and 11% more electors per councillor than the city average (6% more, 3% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% more, equal to, equal to, 2% more, 1% more and 7% more in 2006).

53 The proposed Hulme, Levenshulme, Longsight, Moss Side, Old Moat, Rusholme, Whalley Range and Withington wards would initially have 19% fewer, 7% more, 4% more, 3% more, 7% more, 1% more, 3% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the city average (equal to, 3% more, 1% fewer, 2% more, 2% more, 1% more, 1% more and 1% fewer in 2006).

Beswick & Clayton, Bradford, Central and Newton Heath wards

54 These four wards are located in the centre of the city. Beswick & Clayton, Bradford, Central and Newton Heath wards currently have 27% fewer, 28% fewer, 10% more and 14% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (27% fewer, 20% fewer, 77% more and 20% fewer in 2006).

55 At Stage One the City Council proposed that the current Bradford ward be maintained with the addition of the area of the current Beswick & Clayton ward to the south of Bradford Road and Alan Turing Way. It proposed that the current Newton Heath ward be divided between two new wards, its proposed Clayton Bridge and Miles Platting wards. Its proposed Clayton Bridge ward would comprise the current Beswick & Clayton ward less the area to be transferred to its proposed Bradford ward and an area of the current Newton Heath ward east of Scotland Hall Road, South of Briscoe Lane and Leng Road. It proposed that the remainder of the current Newton Heath ward be combined with that part of the current Central ward to the east of Miller Street and Great Ancoats Street. Its proposed City Centre ward would comprise the remainder of the current Central ward. It acknowledges that its proposed City Centre ward would vary from the city average by 15% by 2006 but argued that it was well defined and that the true nature of occupancy, given a significant business presence and second-home use, would result in a much lower variance.

56 The Liberal Democrats proposed a pattern of four wards in this area. However, these warding arrangements were based on an overall reduction in council size which are incompatible with our proposals for a council size of 96. At Stage One Councillor O'Connor, member for Newton Heath ward, submitted a petition from 530 members of the public who objected to the City Council's proposals to split the Newton Heath ward. It proposed maintaining the Newton Heath area and claimed that the proposals do not take into consideration natural boundaries surrounding the area. It also proposed maintaining the Newton Heath ward name. The Newton Heath Partnership also objected to the City Council's proposals, arguing that they did not maintain the cultural and social identity of the Newton Heath area. We also received four representations from local residents objecting to the City Council's proposals for the Newton Heath area.

55 At Stage One we carefully considered the representations received. We noted that the City Council's proposals would secure an improved level of electoral equality in the area. However, we also noted that the City Council's proposed City Centre ward would have 15% more electors per councillor than the city average by 2006 and that there had been a significant objection to its proposals for the Newton Heath area. Therefore we propose an alternative configuration for the area. We propose a modified Newton Heath ward and a new Clayton Bridge ward. We propose that the majority of the current Newton Heath ward less the area bounded by the Rochdale Canal, Alan Turing Way, the River Medlock and Bank Bridge Road be combined with polling districts CEB, CEC and CED from the current Central ward to form a revised Newton Heath ward. We note that this proposal would maintain the entire Newton Heath community within a single ward while securing a good level of electoral equality. As a result of this proposal it has been necessary to combine the current Beswick & Clayton ward, less the area to be transferred to the proposed Bradford ward, with polling districts CEA, CEH, CEG, CEE and CEF in the current Central ward. We also propose transferring an area of the proposed City Centre ward to the east of Ballon Street, Bradshaw Street, Thomas Street, Hilton Street, Ashton Canal and Store Street, to the proposed Clayton Bridge ward in order to improve electoral equality in the area. While we note the argumentation of the City Council regarding the high electoral variance of its proposed City Centre ward we are of the view that we cannot justify such a high variance in such a densely populated area.

56 Under our draft proposals the proposed Bradford, City Centre, Clayton Bridge and Newton Heath wards would have 10% fewer, 44% fewer, 21% fewer and 6% more electors per councillor than the city average (4% fewer, 10% more, 6% fewer and 3% fewer in 2006).

Blackley, Charlestown, Cheetham, Crumpsall, Harpurhey, Lightbowne and Moston wards

57 These seven wards are located in the north of the city. Blackley, Charlestown, Cheetham, Crumpsall, Harpurhey, Lightbowne and Moston wards currently have 14% fewer, 8% fewer, 3%

fewer, 2% fewer, 20% fewer, 14% fewer and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (19% fewer, 6% fewer, 4% fewer, 6% fewer, 26% fewer, 28% fewer and 1% fewer in 2006).

58 At Stage One the City Council proposed a reconfigured Cheetham ward with the addition of the area of the current Harpurhey ward west of Rochdale Road, south of Harpurhey Road. It proposed that the remainder of the current Harpurhey ward be combined with that area of the current Lightbowne ward to the west of Thorp Road, Kenyon Lane and Worseley Avenue to form a revised Harpurhey ward. Its proposed Moston ward would comprise the remainder of the current Harpurhey ward and that part of the current Moston ward to the south of Nuthurst Road and east of Broadway. It proposed that the remainder of the current Moston ward be combined with that part of the current Charlestown ward to the east of Rochdale Road to form a revised Charlestown ward. It proposed that the area to the west of Rochdale Road and to the north of Old Market Street in the current Charlestown ward be combined with the current Blackley ward and an area of the current Crumpsall ward to the north and east of the river to form a new Higher Blackley ward. It proposed that the majority of the current Crumpsall ward less the area to be transferred to the proposed Higher Blackley ward, be maintained with the addition of the area of the current Charlestown ward to the south of Old Market Street to form a revised Crumpsall ward.

59 Under the City Council's proposals its proposed Charlestown, Cheetham, Crumpsall, Harpurhey, Higher Blackley and Moston wards would initially have 1% more, 1% fewer, equal to, 14% more, 4% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the city average (2% fewer, 3% fewer, 1% fewer, equal to, 2% fewer and 3% fewer in 2006).

60 We have carefully considered the representations received at Stage One. We note the good levels of electoral equality secured under the City Council's proposals and therefore propose basing our draft recommendations upon them. However, we propose a number of amendments to its scheme in order to better reflect local community identity. We have noted the similarities in the proposals of the City Council and Councillor Lyons for the proposed Higher Blackley ward and consider that the City Council's proposals in the south of the ward slightly better reflect community identity in the area than those of Councillor Lyons. Therefore we propose to adopt the City Council's proposed Higher Blackley ward as part of our draft recommendations. We also propose adopting the City Council's proposed Crumpsall ward as we consider that it better reflects the statutory criteria than the current arrangements.

61 We propose to largely adopt the City Council's proposed Cheetham and Harpurhey wards. However we propose transferring the area to the west of Rochdale Road, south of Harpurhey ward, from its proposed Cheetham ward to its proposed Harpurhey ward as we consider the area to have better links with the proposed Harpurhey ward. We also note that under the City Council's proposals the area to the east of the railway line in its proposed Charlestown ward would be isolated from the remainder of the ward. Therefore we propose that the area be transferred to its proposed Moston ward with which we consider it to share better community links. However, in order to facilitate this proposal it has been necessary to transfer an area of the proposed Moston ward to the proposed Charlestown ward. Therefore we propose that the area to the north of Moston Lane and Brookside Road be transferred to the proposed Charlestown ward as we consider that this would better reflect the statutory criteria in the area.

62 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Charlestown, Cheetham, Crumpsall, Harpurhey, Higher Blackley and Moston wards would have 2% fewer, 4% fewer, equal to, 16% more, 4% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the city average (5% fewer, 6% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% more, 2% fewer and 1% more in 2006).

Electoral cycle

63 Under section 7(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, all Metropolitan borough/cities have a system of elections by thirds.

Conclusions

64 Having considered all the evidence and representations received during the initial stage of the review, we propose that:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 99 to 96;
- there should be 32 wards;
- the boundaries of 32 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries;

65 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the City Council's proposals, but propose to depart from them in the following areas:

- we propose boundary amendments between the proposed Brooklands and Northenden, Fallowfield and Moss Side, Ardwick and Longsight, Cheetham and Harpurhey, and Charlestown and Moston wards;
- we propose amending the boundary of the proposed City Centre ward;
- we propose reconfiguring the City Council's proposals in the Newton Heath area.

66 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will effect electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements (based on 2001 electorate figures) and with forecast electorates for the year 2006.

Table 5: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 Electorate		2006 Electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	99	96	99	96
Number of wards	33	32	33	32
Average number of electors per councillor	3,184	3,284	3,252	3,353
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	19	5	22	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	10	2	12	0

67 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Manchester City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 19 to five. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

Draft recommendation

Manchester City Council should comprise 96 councillors serving 32 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Map 2: Draft recommendations for Manchester

5 What happens next?

68 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Manchester contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 22 April 2003. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

69 Express your views by writing directly to us:

**Team Leader
Manchester Review
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

70 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations to consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, ***whether or not*** they agree with our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to The Electoral Commission, which cannot make the Order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after it receives them.

Appendix A

Draft recommendations for Manchester: **Detailed mapping**

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for the Manchester area.

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the city.

The **large maps** illustrate the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Manchester.

Map A1: Draft recommendations for Manchester: Key map

Appendix B

Code of practice on written consultation

The Cabinet Office's November 2000 *Code of Practice on Written Consultation*, www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/servicefirst/index/consultation.htm, requires all Government Departments and Agencies to adhere to certain criteria, set out below, on the conduct of public consultations. Public bodies, such as The Boundary Committee for England, are encouraged to follow the Code.

The Code of Practice applies to consultation documents published after 1 January 2001, which should reproduce the criteria, give explanations of any departures, and confirm that the criteria have otherwise been followed.

Table B1: Boundary Committee for England's compliance with Code criteria

Criteria	Compliance/departure
Timing of consultation should be built into the planning process for a policy (including legislation) or service from the start, so that it has the best prospect of improving the proposals concerned, and so that sufficient time is left for it at each stage.	We comply with this requirement.
It should be clear who is being consulted, about what questions, in what timescale and for what purpose.	We comply with this requirement.
A consultation document should be as simple and concise as possible. It should include a summary, in two pages at most, of the main questions it seeks views on. It should make it as easy as possible for readers to respond, make contact or complain.	We comply with this requirement.
Documents should be made widely available, with the fullest use of electronic means (though not to the exclusion of others), and effectively drawn to the attention of all interested groups and individuals.	We comply with this requirement.
Sufficient time should be allowed for considered responses from all groups with an interest. Twelve weeks should be the standard minimum period for a consultation.	We consult on draft recommendations for a minimum of eight weeks, but may extend the period if consultations take place over holiday periods.
Responses should be carefully and open-mindedly analysed, and the results made widely available, with an account of the views expressed, and reasons for decisions finally taken.	We comply with this requirement.
Departments should monitor and evaluate consultations, designating a consultation coordinator who will ensure the lessons are disseminated.	We comply with this requirement.