Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of South Ribble Borough Council (‘the Council’) to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in February 2013.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 February 2013</td>
<td>Consultation on council size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 May 2013</td>
<td>Invitation to submit proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 August 2013</td>
<td>LGBCE’s analysis and formulation of draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 October 2013</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 January 2014</td>
<td>Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submissions received

During the preliminary stage of this review, we received one submission from the Borough Council on council size. The Council proposed a council size of 50, a reduction of five members from the existing council size of 55. During consultation on council size we received 19 submissions. These submissions proposed council sizes ranging between 25 and 50. During consultation on warding patterns, we received eight submissions including two borough-wide schemes, one from the Council and one from the Labour Group. The remaining submissions provided localised comments on specific parts of the borough. All submissions can be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Analysis and draft recommendations

Electorate figures

South Ribble Borough Council (‘the Council’) submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (‘the 2009 Act’). These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% over this period. This growth was largely due to developments across the borough.
We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

South Ribble Borough Council currently has a council size of 55. The Council originally proposed a council size of 50. They argued that a council size of 50 would ensure that the Council could continue to carry out all of existing functions effectively and provided details on how members would complete the business of the authority and undertake the representational role.

During consultation on council size we received 19 submissions. These proposed a range in council sizes of between 25 and 50. We received no substantive evidence to contradict the rationale presented by the Council, nor was any alternative council size adequately evidenced. We have therefore adopted a council size of 50 as part of our draft recommendations.

General analysis

Having considered the submissions received during consultation on warding arrangements, we have developed proposals based on a combination of the submissions received. In general, we have based our draft recommendations on the proposals from the Borough Council and the Labour Group. In Leyland, Penwortham and the central area of the borough we have proposed some modifications in order to provide for improved levels of electoral equality and reflect the community identity evidence received. Our proposals will provide good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and transport links in the borough.

What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for South Ribble contained in the report. **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.** We will take into account all submissions received by **6 January 2014.** Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

Review Officer  
South Ribble Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG  
reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)
You can also view our draft recommendations for South Ribble on our interactive maps at http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk
1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review South Ribble’s electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 We wrote to South Ribble Borough Council as well as other interested parties, inviting the submission of proposals first on council size and then on warding arrangements for the Council. The submissions received during these stages of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for South Ribble in spring 2014.

What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure ‘electoral equality’, which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation and our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Why are we conducting a review in South Ribble?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on December 2011 electorate data provided by the Council, 33% of the borough’s wards currently have a variance of more than 10%. Of these, Farington East ward has an electoral variance of -26%.

How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your ward name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we would therefore like to stress the importance of providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will be accepting comments and views until 6 January 2014. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in spring 2014. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 18 and more information can be found on our website, www.lgbce.org.uk

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?


Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL
Sir Tony Redmond
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for South Ribble Borough Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed ward boundaries, ward names and parish or town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for South Ribble is to achieve a level of electoral equality – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

12 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the wards we put forward at the end of the review.

13 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral equality is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral equality over a five-year period.

14 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between borough wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single borough ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

15 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of South Ribble Borough Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries and we are not therefore able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

---

Submissions received

16 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited South Ribble Borough Council (‘the Council’) and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received eight submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, including two borough-wide warding proposals. All of the submissions may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

17 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2019, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2014. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (‘the 2009 Act’). These forecasts were broken down to polling borough level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 9% to 2019.

18 The warding patterns received from the Council and Labour Group had both proposed warding patterns using slightly different electorate forecasts to those originally compiled. The original electorate forecasts suggested a total electorate by 2019 of 93,825. The forecasts used for compiling both borough-wide warding patterns suggested an electorate of 93,910 by 2019. When investigating the differences between the warding patterns, it was evident that the forecasts used by the Council in compiling its warding pattern was the more accurate as they had not only broken the forecasts down by polling district but also by individual streets.

19 Having considered the information provided by the Council, we are satisfied that the projected figures used in compiling the borough-wide warding patterns are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

20 South Ribble Borough Council currently has 55 councillors elected from 27 borough wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal for a council size of 50, a reduction of five. In support of its proposal, the Council argued that they sought to retain the current governance arrangements and considered this would be sustainable under a council size of 50. The Council considered each area of its governance arrangements and was of the view that a larger decrease or any increase could not be justified. The Council also considered that a council size of fewer that 50 would also not enable members to be effective in undertaking the representational role, particularly the envisaged workloads resulting from the My Neighbourhood Areas.

21 Having considered the evidence presented by the Council, we were of the view that the evidence supported the case that the number of councillors could be reduced to 50. We determined to consult publically on this council size. This consultation ended on 8 April 2013.
22 We received 19 submissions during the consultation on council size. These were from the Borough Council, Hutton Parish Council and 17 residents.

23 We carefully considered the information provided during the consultation period. The submissions received largely favoured a reduction in council size and many supported a council size of 50. We received two proposals for alternative council sizes of 25 and 27, however, little evidence was provided to support these alternative council sizes.

24 We were therefore minded to adopt a council size of 50 elected members as the basis of this electoral review. A consultation on warding arrangements began on 28 May 2013 and ended on 5 August 2013.

25 During the consultation on warding arrangements we received no representations relating to council size.

26 We are content that a council size of 50 members would not impact adversely on governance arrangements, member workload or councillors’ representational role. Therefore, our draft recommendations for South Ribble Borough Council are based on a council size of 50.

Electoral fairness

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

28 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The borough average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the borough (86,045 in 2012 and 93,910 by 2019) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 50 under our draft recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our draft recommendations is 1,721 in 2012 and 1,878 by 2019.

29 Under our draft recommendations, none of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the borough by 2019. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for South Ribble.

General analysis

30 During the consultation on warding patterns, we received eight submissions, including two borough-wide schemes, one from the Borough Council and the other from the Labour Group. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

31 The borough-wide warding patterns from the Council and Labour Group were both constructed using the five My Neighbourhood Areas. These are Leyland, Penwortham, Central, Eastern and Western Parishes. We understand that these areas reflect community identity in the borough and that some Council services have
been aligned to them. In investigating the different warding patterns we noted that neither proposal suggested a warding pattern which crossed these areas. We have therefore sought to propose a warding pattern which broadly reflects the five My Neighbourhood Areas.

32 We also received an alternative ward proposal from Councillor O’Hare, Councillor Nelson and Councillor Ball. They all suggested a modification to the Council’s proposal in the Walton-le-Dale area.

33 Our draft recommendations are largely based on a combination of the proposals from the Council and Labour Group. We considered that in most parts of the borough, both borough-wide proposals provided for good levels of electoral equality. As part of our draft recommendations we do propose some modifications to the proposals in Leyland, Penwortham and Central. The modifications reflect evidence received on community identity and provide for improved levels of electoral equality. The modifications also provide for more easily identifiable boundaries.

34 Our draft proposals would result in 19 two-member wards and four three-member wards. We consider our proposals provide for good levels of electoral equality while reflecting our understanding of community identities and interests in South Ribble.

35 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations and would encourage interested parties from all parts of the borough to respond. As well as the pattern of warding arrangements proposed, we welcome comments on the ward names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on our proposed parish electoral arrangements.

Electoral arrangements

36 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our draft recommendations for each area of South Ribble. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Leyland (page 9–12)
- Penwortham (page 12–13)
- Western Parishes (page 13)
- Eastern (page 13–15)
- Central (page 15)

37 Details of the draft recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 22–4 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Leyland

38 Leyland is the largest town in the borough; it is unparished and divided by the West Coast railway line and the M6. Under a council size of 50, Leyland is allocated 14 councillors.

39 The Council proposed a warding pattern based on two single-member and six two-member wards covering Leyland. The proposal from the Labour Group was for
seven two-member wards. The warding patterns proposed by the Council and Labour Group were very different from each other.

**Buckshaw**

40 The area of Buckshaw is located in the south-east corner of Leyland. It is an estate which is divided by the boundary of South Ribble Borough Council and Chorley Borough Council. The Council proposed a single-member Buckshaw ward which used the M6 as its western boundary and would have 12% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2019. The Labour Group proposed that the Buckshaw area be included in a two-member Buckshaw & Worden ward to the west of the M6. This ward would have 2% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019.

41 We investigated both proposals to see which one provided the best balance between the statutory criteria. On our tour of the area we observed the Buckshaw area and considered whether the M6 provided a significant barrier which should not be crossed. We considered that the Buckshaw area was a large developed estate which had established its own community. We also observed that the M6 was not a barrier as the road linking Buckshaw with Leyland went over the M6.

42 In addition to the proposals received we also considered the possibility of dividing our proposed Buckshaw & Worden ward into two single-member wards, with one ward covering the area to the east of the M6 (which would be identical to the Council’s proposal) and one including the remainder of our proposed ward – the Worden area. The Buckshaw single-member ward would have 12% fewer electors, and the Worden area would have 4% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019. Having considered the evidence received, we do not consider that we have received community identity evidence to support an electoral variance of -12%. Based on the evidence received, we have decided to include Buckshaw in a ward with Leyland as part of our draft recommendations. However, we would welcome evidence during this consultation period as to whether two single-member wards for Buckshaw and Worden would reflect community identities.

**Central Leyland and Western Leyland**

43 The Council proposed two-member St Andrews, Lowerhouse & Seven Stars and Lostock wards. These wards would have 1% fewer, 6% more and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2019, respectively. The Labour Group proposed a different warding pattern for the area. Their proposals were for the wards of Leyland South-West and Earnshaw Bridge & Lostock. Under the Labour Group proposal these wards would have 1% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

44 The Council’s proposed Lostock ward linked the area on the southern part of Leyland Lane with the communities centred on Moss Side Way and Western Drive. However, this proposal did arbitrarily divide the estate centred on Western Drive, as the Council proposal decided to only include part of the Western Drive and surrounding roads in its Lostock ward. The proposal from the Labour Group included the area on the southern part of Leyland Lane in its Leyland South-West ward. Similarly to the Council they included the communities centred on Moss Side Way and Western Drive together in the same ward. However, the Labour Group proposal did not divide the estate centred on Western Drive.
45 On our tour of the area we observed the different proposals for this part of Leyland. We considered that on the ground the boundary proposed by the Council to divide the estate centred on Western Drive was not easily identifiable. We also observed that Schleswig Way provided the most identifiable boundary on the ground. Therefore, we investigated whether this could be used as a boundary to divide the Labour Group’s proposed Earnshaw Bridge & Lostock ward into two single-member wards. However, doing so would result in electoral variances of more than 20%. We therefore concluded that a warding pattern would have to cross Schleswig Way.

46 Having considered the different proposals for this part of Leyland, we have decided to adopt the Labour Group’s proposed wards of Leyland South-West and Earnshaw Bridge & Lostock as part of our draft recommendations. We are not proposing any modifications to the boundaries of them but do suggest that Leyland South-West be named Wade Hall and Earnshaw Bridge & Lostock be named Earnshaw Bridge. Under our draft recommendations these wards would have 1% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

47 To the west of this area both the Council and Labour Group proposed identical two-member boundaries for a Moss Side & Midge Hall ward. However, the Labour Group proposed this ward be named Moss Side. Under both proposals this ward would have a number of electors per councillor equal to the borough average by 2019. We consider that this provides for a good level of electoral equality and have decided to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations. We also propose the ward be named Moss Side.

Northern Leyland and Eastern Leyland

48 In this part of Leyland the Council proposed a single-member Earnshaw Bridge and two-member Broadfield and St Ambrose wards. These wards would have 9% fewer, 7% more and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2019, respectively. The Labour Group proposed two-member Broadfield, Leyland Central and Leyland East wards. Under the Labour Group proposal these wards would have 3% fewer, 4% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The warding patterns proposed by the Council and Labour Group were very different from each other.

49 As a result of decisions reached on warding proposals in other parts of Leyland, we have decided to adopt the Labour Group’s proposed wards for this part of Leyland as part of our draft recommendations. We did consider the Council’s warding pattern, but adopting all or part of it for this area of Leyland would result in consequential changes to ward boundaries across the town.

50 We do propose a number of modifications to the Labour Group’s proposals in order to provide for more easily identifiable boundaries. Firstly we propose that the southern boundary of the Leyland Central ward follows Church Road and that the western boundary of our proposed Leyland Central ward follows part of School Lane. 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.

51 These modifications result in the wards of Broadfield, Leyland Central and Leyland East having 4% more, 3% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor than
the borough average by 2019, respectively. We also propose the ward Leyland East be named Turpin Green and Leyland Central be named Bannister Brook.

Penwortham

52 The area of Penwortham is located in the north of the borough. The area is parished. Under a council size of 50, Penwortham is allocated 10 councillors. The Council proposed a warding pattern based on one single-member, three two-member and one three-member ward. The proposals from the Labour Group were for two two-member wards and two three-member wards. The warding patterns proposed by the Council and Labour Group were largely similar and differed in the areas of Middleforth, Kingsfold and Broad Oak.

53 The Council proposed a single-member Kingsfold and two-member Middleforth wards. These wards would have 1% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The Council argued that the Kingsfold area represented a separate community to the Middleforth area. They proposed the boundary between the two wards follow Pope Lane and Moss Acre Road. The Labour Group proposed a three-member Middleforth ward for this area. This ward combined the Middleforth and Kingsfold areas in the same ward. This ward would have 5% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019.

54 On our visit to the area we observed the boundary proposed by the Council between the two wards and tested the evidence received on community identity. We were of the view that the boundary proposed by the Council on the ground was not easily identifiable. We also considered that the Kingsfold and Middleforth areas were one community. Therefore, we have decided that a three-member Middleforth ward would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria in this part of Penwortham. We do propose a small modification to the western boundary of the proposed ward. We have decided that the boundary should follow behind a caravan site off Stricklands Lane as this reflects internal communication links in the area. This modification does not change the electoral equality for the proposed Middleforth ward.

55 The Council and Labour Group also proposed different boundaries between the wards of Broad Oak and Howick, Priory & Whitefield (named Howick & Priory under the Labour Group proposal). The Council proposed that the boundary follow Ashtree Grove, Broadwood Close, Manor Avenue and part of Manor Lane. The Labour Group suggested the boundary follow Moorhey Drive, Longfield, Manor Avenue and Beechway. On our tour of the area we observed both of the proposed boundaries. We noted that a number of roads in this part of Penwortham were blocked off and did not have complete access. Having visited the area we considered that the boundary proposed by the Labour Group was the more easily identifiable and reflected the road network. We have therefore decided to adopt the Labour Group’s proposals for this part of Penwortham as part of our draft recommendations. Under our draft recommendations, the wards of Broad Oak and Howick & Priory would have 2% more and 4% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

56 The Council and Labour Group proposed identical wards covering the remainder of the Penwortham area. This was for a two-member Charnock ward, which would have 3% more electors per councillor than the borough average by
Having considered the evidence received, we have decided to include this ward as part of our draft recommendations without modification.

Western Parishes

This area covers the four parishes of Longton, Hutton, Much Hoole and Little Hoole. Under a council size of 50, this area is allocated seven councillors. The Council proposed two two-member wards of New Longton, Hutton East & Whitestake and Little Hoole & Much Hoole and a three-member ward of Longton & Hutton West. These wards would have 4% more, 5% fewer and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. The wards proposed by the Labour Group covering this part of the borough were identical to those proposed by the Council.

On our visit of the area, we observed the proposed boundary dividing Hutton. We investigated whether an alternative ward boundary could follow the A59. However, this resulted in poor levels of electoral equality and would have meant the creation of a parish ward in eastern Hutton which would have had too few electors to be viable. We then investigated whether the Council’s proposed boundary dividing Hutton should be modified to follow the backs of properties on Ratten Lane. This modification would result in the wards of New Longton, Hutton East & Whitestake and Longton & Hutton West having 5% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively. We consider this boundary is more easily identifiable and have included it as part of our draft recommendations.

For the remaining part of the Western area we have decided to adopt the Council’s proposed ward of Little Hoole & Much Hoole as part of our draft recommendations. We have decided to modify the names of the proposed wards for this part of the borough. We proposed the wards be named Longton & Hutton West, New Longton & Hutton East and Hoole. Our draft recommendations for this part of the borough are for wards of Longton & Hutton West, New Longton & Hutton East and Hoole. These wards would have 7% fewer, 5% more and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

Eastern

This part of South Ribble covers the areas of Walton-le-Dale, Bamber Bridge, Coupe Green, Gregson Lane, Samlesbury and Walton. Under a council size of 50 this area is allocated 12 councillors. The Council proposed two-member wards of Bamber Bridge East; Bamber Bridge West; Walton-le-Dale East; Walton-le-Dale West; Coupe Green, Gregson Lane & Hospital Inn; and Samlesbury & Walton. These wards would have 4% fewer, 4% fewer, 1% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% more and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

The Labour Group proposed identical boundaries for the wards covering Coupe Green & Gregson Lane, Samlesbury & Walton and Bamber Bridge West. They proposed different wards covering the areas of Bamber Bridge East and Walton-le-Dale. These were Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge North and Walton-le-Dale. These wards would have 1% fewer, 4% fewer and equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the borough by 2019, respectively.
The Council proposed that an area of housing to the south of Cottage Lane and East of Brindle Road be included north in its Walton-le-Dale East ward. The Labour Group proposed that this be included in its Bamber Bridge East ward. In order to balance electoral equality, the Labour Group proposed that an area of housing centred on Fourfields be included in its Bamber Bridge North ward. During our tour of the area, we observed the boundaries proposed by the Council and Labour Group. We considered that neither provided for easily identifiable boundaries nor reflected community identities. We have therefore proposed a Bamber Bridge East ward which is a combination of the Council’s and Labour Group’s proposals. Our Bamber Bridge East ward is bound to the north by School Lane and Cottage Lane, west by Station Road, south by the A6 and east by the M6. This ward includes the area of housing to the east of Brindle Road and the area of housing centred on Fourfields. Our two-member Bamber Bridge East ward would have 5% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

As a consequence of the proposals covering Bamber Bridge East we propose a different configuration of wards for Bamber Bridge West and Walton-le-Dale East. The Council and Labour Group both proposed that the boundary between these wards run along the backs of properties on Pear Tree Crescent and Danesway. In order to provide for reasonable levels of electoral equality we propose that the boundary between the two wards follow the backs of properties on St Mary’s Avenue rather than Danesway. This modification results in our Bamber Bridge West and Walton-le-Dale East wards having 9% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.

The Council and Labour Group also proposed different wards covering the remainder of Walton-le-Dale and the area of Lostock Hall. We note that the area of Lostock Hall is included in the Central My Neighbourhood area. However, the proposals received for this part of the borough suggested ward boundaries which did not completely follow the My Neighbourhood boundaries.

The Council proposed a two-member Walton-le-Dale West ward which would have a southern boundary of a footpath and cycle track, then would cross the public footpath at Leigh Brow in order to include an area of housing centred on Tudor Road and Eagleton Way. Under the Council’s proposal this ward would have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019. This ward would not have internal communication links as it would not be possible to drive from Tudor Road and Eagleton Way to the other part of Walton-le-Dale without having to leave the ward.

The Labour Group proposed that the area of housing on Tudor Road and Eagleton Way be included in its three-member Lostock Hall ward. They proposed a northern boundary between Walton-le-Dale and Lostock Hall that completely followed the public footpath. Under their proposals the wards of Lostock Hall and Walton-le-Dale would have 7% more and equal to the number of electors per councillor than the average for the borough by 2019, respectively. This ward would also not have complete internal communication links as in order to travel from Tudor Road and Eagleton Way to Lostock Hall you would have to leave the ward for approximately 100 yards.

We also received an alternative proposal for this part of the borough from Councillor O’Hare, Councillor Nelson and Councillor Ball. They did not support the Council’s proposed boundary of Hennel Lane. They considered that this boundary
divided the housing estate centred on Carrwood Way. They proposed an alternative boundary to the south of Carrwood Way which would ensure that all the housing estate was included in a Walton-le-Dale ward. The Councillor’s proposal also included the housing on Tudor Road and Eagleton Way in a Walton-le-Dale ward. Again, this ward would not have complete internal communication links.

68 We investigated the different warding proposals for this area. We observed the Council’s proposed boundary of Hennel Lane during our tour of the area and considered that it did split the community centred on Carrwood Way. We understand that a road is to be built that would link the roads of Tudor Road and Eagleton Way with the rest of Walton-le-Dale. This road would cross the public footpath and be a result of planned development in the area. We considered that the Labour Group’s proposal to use the public footpath as a boundary between the Walton-le-Dale and Lostock Hall areas reflected the current communities and internal communication links. We accept that this ward would not have complete internal communication links but that this was only for a small area. This ward also does not divide the community centred on Carrwood Way. Our draft recommendations are for a three-member Lostock Hall and two-member Walton-le-Dale West ward. These wards would have 7% more and equal to the number of electors per councillor for the borough by 2019, respectively.

69 To the east of this area the Council proposed two-member Coupe Green, Gregson Lane & Hospital Inn and Samlesbury & Walton wards. The Labour Group proposed wards with identical boundaries but suggested the ward name of Coupe Green & Gregson Lane. The ward proposed covering the areas of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane including an area of housing which is bound to the south by a railway line, west by the M6 and east by the M61. We observed this area during our tour of the borough and agree with the proposals to include it in a ward with the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane areas. However, we do propose a modification to the southern boundary. Rather than follow the railway line we propose the boundary follow the M6 and the borough council boundary. This modification results in our two-member Coupe Green & Gregson Lane ward having 3% more electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019. We have also decided to adopt the proposed Samlesbury & Walton ward as part of our draft recommendations. This ward would have 8% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019.

Central

70 This part of South Ribble covers the areas of Farington and Lostock Hall. Under a council size of 50, this area is allocated seven councillors. Our proposals for the Lostock Hall area are covered above in paragraphs 68–69.

71 The Council and Labour Group proposed identical two-member Farington East and Farington West wards. These wards had reasonable levels of electoral equality and had easily identifiable boundaries. We have adopted both wards as part of our draft recommendations subject to the consequential modifications resulting from our warding proposals for Leyland (detailed in paragraph 50). Our Farington East and Farington West wards would have 5% fewer and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2019, respectively.
Conclusions

72 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2019 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft recommendation
South Ribble Borough Council should comprise 50 councillors serving 23 wards as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the map accompanying this report.

Parish electoral arrangements

73 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

74 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, South Ribble Borough Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

75 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Farington.

Draft recommendation
Farington Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Farington Central (returning three members), Farington East (returning two members) and Farington West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.
76 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Hutton.

**Draft recommendation**
Hutton Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Hutton East (returning four members) and Hutton West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

77 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Longton.

**Draft recommendation**
Longton Parish Council should return 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Longton East (returning five members) and Longton West (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

78 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Penwortham.

**Draft recommendation**
Penwortham Parish Council should return 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Broad Oak (returning four members), Charnock (returning four members), Howick & Priory (returning five members) and Middleforth (returning five members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.
3  What happens next?

79  There will now be a consultation period of 12 weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for South Ribble contained in this report. We will take into account fully all submissions received by 6 January 2014. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

80  We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for South Ribble and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, ward names and parish electoral arrangements. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during the consultation on our draft recommendations. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

81  Express your views by writing directly to:

Review Officer  
South Ribble Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk or by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk

82  Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations received during the consultation on our draft recommendations will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of South Ribble and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

83  If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

84  In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

85  After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft
Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for South Ribble in 2015.
4 Mapping

Draft recommendations for South Ribble

The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for South Ribble Borough Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for South Ribble Borough Council.

You can also view our draft recommendations for South Ribble on our interactive maps at [http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)
## Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for South Ribble Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2012)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2019)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bamber Bridge East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>1,766</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bamber Bridge West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,304</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3,426</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Bannister Brook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>1,932</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Broadfield</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,611</td>
<td>1,806</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3,904</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Broad Oak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,826</td>
<td>1,913</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Buckshaw &amp; Worden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,222</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Charnock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>1,497</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Coupe Green &amp; Gregson Lane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,674</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3,858</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Earnshaw Bridge</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,717</td>
<td>1,859</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>1,954</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Farington East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for South Ribble Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2012)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2019)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 Farington West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,039</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>3,707</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Hoole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td>3,547</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Howick &amp; Priory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,842</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Longton &amp; Hutton West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,790</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5,217</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Lostock Hall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Middleforth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5,925</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Moss Side</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,270</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>3,752</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 New Longton &amp; Hutton East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,734</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Samlesbury &amp; Walton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Turpin Green</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Wade Hall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Walton-le-Dale East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>3,491</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for South Ribble Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2012)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
<th>Electorate (2019)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walton-le-Dale West</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,763</td>
<td>1,882</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3,765</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,045</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>93,910</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>1,721</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td><strong>1,878</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by South Ribble Borough Council.

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

### Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)</td>
<td>A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation’s interest to safeguard it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent areas</td>
<td>The geographical areas that make up any one ward or division, expressed in parishes or existing wards or divisions, or parts of either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council size</td>
<td>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral fairness</td>
<td>When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral imbalance</td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate</td>
<td>People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-member ward or division</td>
<td>A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td>The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-represented</td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish council</td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also ‘Town council’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</td>
<td>The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish ward</strong></td>
<td>A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PER (or periodic electoral review)</strong></td>
<td>A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political management arrangements</strong></td>
<td>The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town council</strong></td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance (or electoral variance)</strong></td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward</strong></td>
<td>A specific area of a borough or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the borough or borough council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>