

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Liverpool City

Report to The Electoral Commission

March 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.

Report no. 326

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee For England?	5
Summary	7
1. Introduction	11
2. Current electoral arrangements	13
3. Draft recommendations	17
4. Responses to consultation	19
5. Analysis and final recommendations	23
6. What happens next?	51
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Liverpool City: detailed mapping	53
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	55
C First draft of electoral change Order	57

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 and town councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Liverpool City.

Summary

We began a review of Liverpool's electoral arrangements on 4 December 2001. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 3 September 2002, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We now submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations that we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Liverpool:

- **in 20 of the 33 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city and eleven wards vary by more than 20%;**
- **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 thirteen wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 231-232) are that:

- **Liverpool City Council should have 90 councillors, nine fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 30 wards, instead of 33 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 33 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and no 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 28 of the proposed 30 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the borough average.**
- **This 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 6% from the average for the borough in 2006.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 6 May 2003. *The information in the representations will be available for public access once the Order has been made:*

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0667

**Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose)**

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Allerton & Hunts Cross	3	part of Allerton ward and part of Woolton ward	3
2	Anfield	3	part of Anfield ward; part of Breckfield ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1
3	Belle Vale	3	Netherley ward; part of Childwall and part of Valley wards	3
4	Central	3	part of Abercromby ward; part of Everton ward; part of Kensington ward and part of Smithdown ward	1 and 2
5	Childwall	3	part of Childwall ward and part of Valley ward	3
6	Church	3	part of Allerton ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Grassendale ward	2 and 3
7	Clubmoor	3	part of Clubmoor ward; part of County ward; part of Pirrie ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1
8	County	3	part of County ward; part of Melrose ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
9	Cressington	3	part of Allerton ward; part of Grassendale ward and part of St Mary's ward	2 and 3
10	Croxteth	3	part of Croxteth ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1
11	Everton	3	part of Breckfield ward; part of Everton ward; part of Kensington ward and part of Vauxhall ward	1
12	Fazakerley	3	part of Gillmoss ward; part of Fazakerley ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
13	Greenbank	3	part of Aigburth ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Picton ward	2
14	Kensington & Fairfield	3	part of Kensington ward; part of Smithdown ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1 and 2
15	Kirkdale	3	part of Everton ward; part of Melrose ward and part of Vauxhall ward	1
16	Knotty Ash	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Childwall ward; part of Croxteth ward and part of Dovecot ward	1 and 3
17	Mossley Hill	3	part of Aigburth ward and part of Grassendale ward	2 and 3
18	Norris Green	3	part of Clubmoor ward; part of Gillmoss ward; part of Fazakerley ward and part of Pirrie ward	1
19	Old Swan	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Kensington ward and part of Old Swan ward	1, 2 and 3
20	Picton	3	part of Arundel ward; part of Kensington ward; part of Picton ward and part of Smithdown ward	2
21	Princes Park	3	Granby ward; part of Abercromby ward and part of Smithdown ward	2
22	Riverside	3	part of Abercromby ward and part of Dingle ward	2
23	St Michael's	3	part of Aigburth ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Dingle ward	2
24	Speke-Garston	3	Speke ward and part of St Mary's ward	2 and 3
25	Tuebrook & Stoneycroft	3	part of Anfield ward; part of Clubmoor ward; part of Croxteth ward; part of Old Swan ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1
26	Warbreck	3	part of County ward; part of Pirrie ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
27	Wavertree	3	Church ward and part of Childwall ward and part of Picton ward	2 and 3
28	West Derby	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Croxteth ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
29	Woolton	3	part of Allerton ward; part of Childwall ward; part of Church ward and part of Woolton ward	3
30	Yew Tree	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Croxteth ward; part of Dovecot ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1

Notes:

1. *The whole city is unparished.*
2. *The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.*

Table 2: Final recommendations for Liverpool

	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	Allerton & Hunts Cross	3	11,025	3,675	-3	11,098	3,699	-2
2	Anfield	3	12,031	4,010	6	11,374	3,791	1
3	Belle Vale	3	11,586	3,862	2	11,295	3,765	0
4	Central	3	9,246	3,082	-19	11,511	3,837	2
5	Childwall	3	11,436	3,812	1	11,441	3,814	1
6	Church	3	11,316	3,772	0	11,309	3,770	0
7	Clubmoor	3	11,686	3,895	3	11,318	3,773	0
8	County	3	11,455	3,818	1	10,913	3,638	-3
9	Cressington	3	11,429	3,810	1	11,257	3,752	0
10	Croxteth	3	10,693	3,564	-6	11,242	3,747	0
11	Everton	3	11,899	3,966	5	11,681	3,894	3
12	Fazakerley	3	11,599	3,866	2	11,184	3,728	-1
13	Greenbank	3	11,638	3,879	3	11,760	3,920	4
14	Kensington & Fairfield	3	11,304	3,768	0	10,853	3,618	-4
15	Kirkdale	3	12,021	4,007	6	11,617	3,872	3
16	Knotty Ash	3	10,704	3,568	-6	10,744	3,581	-5
17	Mossley Hill	3	10,467	3,489	-8	10,612	3,537	-6
18	Norris Green	3	11,955	3,985	5	11,413	3,804	1
19	Old Swan	3	12,248	4,083	8	11,991	3,997	6
20	Picton	3	12,337	4,112	9	11,411	3,804	1
21	Princes Park	3	11,707	3,902	3	11,722	3,907	4
22	Riverside	3	9,590	3,197	-16	11,401	3,800	1
23	St Michael's	3	10,755	3,585	-5	10,952	3,651	-3
24	Speke-Garston	3	12,437	4,146	10	11,773	3,924	4
25	Tuebrook & Stoneycroft	3	12,141	4,047	7	11,394	3,798	1
26	Warbreck	3	11,087	3,696	-2	10,848	3,616	-4
27	Wavertree	3	11,213	3,738	-1	11,000	3,667	-3
28	West Derby	3	11,473	3,824	1	11,664	3,888	3
29	Woolton	3	11,036	3,679	-3	11,177	3,726	-1
30	Yew Tree	3	10,967	3,656	-3	10,973	3,658	-3
	Totals	90	340,481	-	-	338,928	-	-
	Average	-	-	3,783	-	-	3,766	-

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.

Introduction

1 This report contains our final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for Liverpool City. We are reviewing the five metropolitan boroughs in Merseyside 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 Liverpool City. Liverpool City's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1979 (Report no. 319).

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had 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 Liverpool City was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reviews*. This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations 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 and town councils in the borough.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the district 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 the 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 to the number of councillors that can be returned from each metropolitan city ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan 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 lead to an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 4 December 2001, when we wrote to Liverpool City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Merseyside Police Authority, the local authority associations, Lancashire Association of Parish & Town Councils, the Members of Parliament with constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Northwest region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 March 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 3 September 2002 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Liverpool City* and ended on 28 October 2002. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 Current electoral arrangements

11 The city of Liverpool is a metropolitan authority covering 11,276 hectares with a population of 468,000. It has a diverse mixture of industry and commerce within the city's boundaries and is famous as one of the world's most important ports. The great wealth earned by the city's merchants and ship owners is reflected in many fine buildings across the city including the Royal Liver building, St George's Hall and the Liverpool museum. The city's two cathedrals are also excellent architectural examples. Liverpool also boasts a significant musical heritage with groups such as the Beatles. The city has excellent communications: two Mersey Tunnels, motorway and rail links with London and other principal cities and a major airport at Speke within the city area.

12 The electorate of the city is 340,481 (December 2001). The City Council presently has 99 members who are elected from 33 wards, all of which are urban. All wards are three-member wards and the area is completely unparished.

13 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,439 electors, which the City Council forecasts will decrease to 3,424 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 20 of the 33 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average, 11 wards by more than 20% and eight wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Vauxhall ward where each councillor represents 48% fewer electors than the city average.

14 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 Liverpool

Table 3: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Abercromby	3	10,834	3,611	5	12,736	4,245	24
2	Aigburth	3	13,847	4,616	34	14,157	4,719	38
3	Allerton	3	12,136	4,045	18	12,248	4,083	19
4	Anfield	3	10,769	3,590	4	10,127	3,376	-1
5	Arundel	3	11,080	3,693	7	10,823	3,608	5
6	Breckfield	3	8,456	2,819	-18	7,983	2,661	-22
7	Broadgreen	3	11,475	3,825	11	11,330	3,777	10
9	Childwall	3	13,045	4,348	26	13,032	4,344	27
10	Church	3	14,942	4,981	45	14,883	4,961	45
11	Clubmoor	3	9,325	3,108	-10	8,994	2,998	-12
12	County	3	10,939	3,646	6	10,592	3,531	3
13	Croxteth	3	13,312	4,437	29	13,516	4,505	32
14	Dingle	3	9,989	3,330	-3	10,418	3,473	1
15	Dovecot	3	9,522	3,174	-8	9,633	3,211	-6
16	Everton	3	6,674	2,225	-35	8,860	2,953	-14
17	Fazakerley	3	10,902	3,634	6	10,475	3,492	2
18	Gillmoss	3	13,689	4,563	33	14,152	4,717	38
19	Granby	3	8,222	2,741	-20	8,065	2,688	-21
20	Grassendale	3	11,952	3,984	16	12,134	4,045	18
21	Kensington	3	10,271	3,424	0	9,915	3,305	-3
22	Melrose	3	9,675	3,225	-6	8,951	2,984	-13
23	Netherley	3	5,706	1,902	-45	5,532	1,844	-46
24	Old Swan	3	9,902	3,301	-4	9,692	3,231	-6
25	Picton	3	11,098	3,699	8	10,352	3,451	1
26	Smithdown	3	8,531	2,844	-17	8,255	2,752	-20
27	Speke	3	6,161	2,054	-40	5,719	1,906	-44
28	St Mary's	3	8,954	2,985	-13	8,436	2,812	-18
29	Tuebrook	3	11,340	3,780	10	10,689	3,563	4
30	Valley	3	7,185	2,395	-30	7,055	2,352	-31
31	Vauxhall	3	5,374	1,791	-48	5,578	1,859	-46
32	Warbreck	3	13,849	4,616	34	13,531	4,510	32
33	Woolton	3	12,146	4,049	18	12,286	4,095	20
	Totals	99	340,481	-	-	338,928	-	-
	Averages	-	-	3,439	-	-	3,424	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Liverpool 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 Vauxhall ward were relatively over-represented by 48%, while electors in Church ward were significantly under-represented by 45%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 Draft recommendations

15 During Stage One 426 representations were received, including city-wide schemes from Liverpool City Council, the Labour Group and Councillors Marbrow and Firth. We also received submissions from a local political group, four local councillors, two local community groups and 418 local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Liverpool City*.

16 Our draft recommendations were based on the City Council's proposals, with amendments, which we considered to provide excellent levels of electoral equality and best satisfied the statutory criteria. However, we moved away from the City Council's scheme in the south and mid-west of the city, using options put forward by the Labour Group, together with some of our own proposals. We proposed that:

- Liverpool City Council should be served by 90 councillors, compared with the current 99, representing 30 wards, three fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, while no ward should retain its existing boundaries.

Draft recommendation

Liverpool City Council should comprise 90 councillors, serving 30 wards.

17 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 28 of the 30 wards varying by no more than 10% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with no ward varying by more than 10% from the average in 2006.

4 Responses to consultation

18 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 298 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Liverpool City Council.

Liverpool City Council

19 The City Council highlighted areas it supported in the draft recommendations and proposed amendments between the proposed County and Warbreck wards, Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards and also between the proposed Greenbank and St Michael's wards.

20 The City Council also objected to the proposed warding arrangement in the south of the city and reiterated its proposals made during Stage One. It addressed the principles behind the Boundary Committee's proposed changes and assessed them against both the electoral review criteria and the City Council's own justification for its proposed warding arrangement in the area. The City Council considered there to be more persuasive reasons for combining Speke with part of Garston and argued on the basis of community ties, effective and convenient local government, electoral equality and identifiable boundaries.

21 The City Council also proposed three ward name changes. It proposed that Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward should be renamed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward, Belle Vale ward should be renamed Valley ward and the proposed Otterspool ward should be renamed Mossley Hill ward.

The Liberal Party

22 The Liberal Party commented on deprived areas, under-registration and the inclusion of entire streets/roads in single wards and also agreed with the proposal to reduce the number of wards from 33 to 30.

23 The Liberal Party highlighted areas of the draft recommendations it supported and also proposed amendments between the proposed County and Warbreck wards, Croxteth and West Derby wards, Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards.

24 The Liberal Party also considers the City Council's original proposal to offer the best warding arrangement for the south of the city. It proposed a boundary amendment in the southern area should the Boundary Committee put forward its own draft proposals as part of the final recommendations.

25 The Liberal Party also proposed six ward name changes. It proposed that West Derby ward should be renamed West Derby Village ward, Wavertree ward should be renamed Wavertree Gardens ward, Church ward should be renamed Calderstones ward, Cressington ward should be renamed Grassendale ward, Otterspool ward should be renamed Aigburth or Aigburth and Mossley Hill ward and the proposed Riverside ward should be renamed Cathedral or Brunswick ward.

The Liberal Democrat Group

26 The Liberal Democrat Group objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward and considered it to make no sense in terms of community or size. It also proposed amendments between the proposed Belle Vale and Childwall wards and considered the Labour Group's original boundary between the proposed St Michael's and Riverside wards should be adopted. The Liberal Democrat Group also proposed amendments between the proposed Old Swan and Tuebrook &

Stoneycroft wards and Croxteth and West Derby wards while it supported the City Council's proposed amendment between Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards.

27 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed one ward name change. It proposed that Tuebrook & Stoneyford ward should be renamed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward.

Other representations

28 A further 295 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, councillors, residents associations and residents.

29 The Labour Group supported the draft recommendations for the south of the city, reiterating its reasons given at Stage One. Liberal Democrats Grassendale Ward supported the proposed Cressington ward. Allerton Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations for the Hunts Cross area and highlighted its links with Woolton and Allerton and also the physical separation this area has from Speke. Woolton Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations for Woolton but proposed a boundary amendment to the south of the proposed ward, offering two alternatives, in order to group an area that would have more affiliation to Woolton rather than Hunts Cross, in a single ward. Allerton & Hunts Cross Conservative Association supported the proposal not to link Hunts Cross with Speke but was disappointed with the proposed splitting of the Jewish community on Booker Avenue and Mather Avenue. It also queried the inclusion of a development in the proposed Hunts Cross ward.

30 Townsend Lane Working Group proposed an amendment between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards in order to group the area covered by the working group in a single ward. Gledhill Residents Association proposed that the seven properties on Mossley Hill Drive be included in the proposed Greenbank ward and not St Michael's ward, as proposed at Stage One. Newsham Park Residents Association proposed an amendment between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards in order to group the area covered by the association in a single ward. Meads Residents Association objected to the proposed Allerton ward.

31 Hope Street Association objected to the proposed splitting between two wards of the Hope Street area. The Wavertree Society supported the proposed Wavertree ward and welcomed the use of the proposed Picton and Wavertree ward names. The society also proposed that Church ward should be renamed Calderstones ward. The Woolton Society did not consider the reduction in councillors to be justified and proposed an amendment to the proposed Woolton ward southern boundary.

32 Two local councillors highlighted areas they supported in the proposed Croxteth ward and proposed two boundary amendments to Croxteth ward. A local councillor supported the proposed Belle Vale ward name. A local resident proposed a boundary amendment between the proposed West Derby and Knotty Ash wards.

33 Five local residents objected to the proposed Woolton ward boundary. One local resident would like no change to the existing boundaries in the south of the city. A local resident proposed an alternative five ward arrangement for the south of the city which he considered to better satisfy the statutory criteria.

34 We received submissions from three local councillors objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. One of the councillors proposed a Speke ward that included neither Hunts Cross or any part of Garston. Both other local councillors urged the Boundary Committee to revert to the City Council's alternative proposals for this area and attached supporting petitions. We received a petition from St Mary's Liberal Democrats which objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward and supported the City Council's proposals for this area. We received another petition from Garston & District Community Council which objected to the proposed Speke-

Garston ward. Speke/Garston Tenants Group objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Two Loyal Orange Institutions of England objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Seven local Garston residents objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward with two residents urging the Boundary Committee to accept the City Council's proposals for this area. Riverside Credit Union supported the proposed Speke-Garston ward.

35 We received a submission from two local Speke councillors objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward, the councillors also offered support for the City Council's alternative proposals for the southern area of the city. Speke Action Group submitted a petition objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward and supported the City Council's alternative proposals for the southern area of the city. A local resident objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward.

36 We received representations from 257 local Hunts Cross residents in support of the proposed Hunts Cross ward.

5 Analysis and final recommendations

37 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Liverpool 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'.

38 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 within the next five years. We also must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties.

39 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.

40 We accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the 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

41 Since 1975 there has been an 18% decrease in the electorate of Liverpool City. At Stage One the Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting a minimal decrease in the electorate from 340,481 to 338,928 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science and, having considered the forecast electorates, we stated in our draft recommendations report that we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

42 We received no responses in relation to the Council's electorate forecasts during Stage Three; however, the City Council highlighted several discrepancies in ward figure totals arrived at by the Boundary Committee. We acknowledge the City Council's calculations and concur with the totals it has arrived at, these changes are reflected in Table 2.

Council size

43 Liverpool City Council presently has 99 members. In the draft recommendations report we adopted the Council's proposal for a council of 90 members as proposed by the City Council, the Labour Group and Councillors Marbrow and Firth. The City Council's Governance Review Group (GRG) considered the roles of elected members within the new constitution as compared with the roles for members under the traditional committee system before recommending to the Electoral Review Group that there should be a reduction of nine councillors to a council size of

90. It also considered that any substantial decrease in numbers of councillors would lessen the opportunity for members to carry out their community representative role effectively. The GRG highlighted key roles for members within the new governance arrangements and the considerable amount of time needed by members to undertake these roles. Finally and having considered all the detail the GRG believed that there was room for only marginal changes in the number of councillors if all roles envisaged by the government are to be adequately carried out. This proposed council size of 90 members received cross-party support and was further supported by Councillors Marbrow and Firth and the Labour Group with the latter adding the need to retain a high amount of councillors for effective scrutiny to ensure good governance and effective carrying out of the community champion role.

44 Having considered the representations received, given that there was cross-party consensus and having been convinced by the argumentation that 90 councillors would provide effective and convenient local government under the new political management system we were content to base the draft recommendations on a council size of 90 members.

45 During Stage Three we received two submissions in relation to council size. The Liberal Party agreed with the proposed reduction in council size. The Woolton Society did not consider the reduction in councillors to be justified. We noted the argument put forward by the Woolton Society but in light of the argumentation and cross-party support received at Stage One we are content to endorse a council size of 90 members as part of our final recommendations.

Electoral arrangements

46 As each city-wide scheme received during Stage One agreed on a council size of 90 members we were able to consider all proposed warding arrangements when formulating our draft recommendations and we looked at combining schemes where we felt they best met the statutory criteria. We noted areas of similarity between all schemes in the north and east of the city and in the south between the City Council and Councillors Marbrow and Firth's scheme. Each scheme provided for a different warding pattern throughout the remainder of the city. There were areas of consensus on ward names but where this was not evident we adopted the ward name proposed by the adopted scheme and where we put forward our own proposals we adopted the name we considered to best reflect the local area.

47 After careful consideration of all the evidence received at Stage One we considered that the City Council's proposals would represent a better balance between the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One and we were content to endorse these proposals substantially. We considered the City Council's proposals would provide the best reflection of community identities and interests across the city by using easily identifiable boundaries and respecting natural communities. In the mid-city to north area we considered the City Council to have utilised excellent boundaries while paying respect to natural communities such as that north and south of East Lancashire Road and in the Croxteth, Picton and West Derby areas. Its proposals would also offer excellent levels of electoral equality.

48 However, having regard to local communities' identities and interests and in order to utilise what we considered to be strong boundaries, we decided to move away from the City Council's proposals in the south and south-west of the city adopting the Labour Group's proposed Cressington and Speke-Garston wards while adopting our own Hunts Cross, Otterspool and St Michael's wards using boundaries put forward in each city-wide scheme. The Labour Group's scheme in this southern area we considered to best satisfy the statutory criteria as it retained the Hunts Cross and Allerton link and we noted the local support for this proposal, we further noted the objection by local Hunts Cross residents of being included in a ward with Speke. We also adopted Councillors Marbrow and Firth's proposed Belle Vale ward as it was the same as that proposed by the City Council and the Labour Group.

49 As a result of the consultation process we propose a number of amendments in Liverpool City. In the north of the city we propose amendments between Warbreck and County wards, Anfield and Tuebrook & Stonecroft wards, Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stonecroft wards. We also propose amendments between Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stonecroft wards and between Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stonecroft wards. These proposals have been locally proposed by the City Council, Liberal Party, Liberal Democrat Group or local residents groups in order to better reflect local communities and the Boundary Committee is content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

50 In the mid-city area we propose an amendment between the proposed Greenbank and St Michael's wards, this proposal was proposed by a local residents group and endorsed by the City Council and we concur that the proposed amendment better reflects the local community. We noted the support for the remaining draft recommendations in this area and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

51 We noted the amendments proposed in the eastern area of the city and, in particular, the support the amendment to the proposed Croxteth ward received. However, we remain of the opinion that the draft recommendations for this area best satisfy the statutory criteria as they follow strong boundaries and group similar communities in single wards.

52 In the south of the city we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Woolton and Hunts Cross wards in order to include part of Hunts Cross ward that has more community affiliation with the Woolton area. We received three proposed amendments for this area and consider the adopted proposal to better reflect the local community and it achieves good levels of electoral equality.

53 We noted the local reaction to our draft recommendations in the south of the city, in particular the proposed Speke-Garston and Hunts Cross wards. We noted the opposition from local Speke and Garston residents to the proposed Speke-Garston ward while the City Council argued that its proposed warding arrangement for this area better satisfied the statutory criteria. We also noted the support from local residents for the proposed Hunts Cross ward.

54 We considered the arguments put forward for this area in detail and acknowledge the fact that there are three very distinct communities in this southern area of the city and that two must be paired together in order to achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality. Having considered the evidence received we remain convinced that our draft recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We consider the alternatives proposed to have merit but in order to adopt the City Council's proposed arrangement for this area it would involve a major redrawing of wards in the southern area that would affect surrounding wards that have been locally supported. We also remain of the opinion that Hunts Cross is a separate community in relation to Speke and Garston and would not look southward on a community basis. We acknowledge the fact that the areas of Speke and Garston have their individual characteristics but in respect of the statutory criteria we consider this pairing to provide a better balance than any other alternative available. Also, it was not possible to retain the Speke area in a ward of its own as it resulted in a poor level of electoral equality.

55 In addition we propose three ward name changes in the city in order to better reflect the areas within the proposed wards.

56 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- i. Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards;
- ii. Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot wards;
- iii. Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie wards;
- iv. Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards;
- v. Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall wards;
- vi. Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton wards;
- vii. Arundel, Church and Picton wards;
- viii. Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown wards;
- ix. Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale wards;
- x. Allerton, St Mary's and Speke wards.

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

Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards

58 The existing wards of Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck cover the northern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 6%, 33% and 34% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Fazakerley and Warbreck wards while deteriorating in Gillmoss ward to vary from the city average by 2%, 32% and 38% respectively by 2006.

59 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards, with the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards being represented by three councillors each. It proposed that Warbreck ward should contain the majority of the existing ward with its southern boundary running south of Walton Hospital and Rice Lane until it reaches Queens Drive. It would then follow the rear of properties south of Carnarvon Court and Manorbier Crescent before running along the north of Walton Hall Park until it reached Walton Hall Avenue before finally following the rear of properties on the west side of Torrisholme Road and joining Stopgate Lane. Stopgate Lane, Long Lane, the railway line and the Trans Pennine Trail would provide the eastern boundary that divides the proposed Warbreck and Fazakerley wards with the remaining boundary being that of the city boundary.

60 The proposed Fazakerley ward would be bounded by the eastern Warbreck boundary while its southern boundary would follow the East Lancashire Road apart from when it would run along the rear of properties on the north side of Long Lane until reaching Lower Lane and rejoining East Lancashire Road, with the remainder of the boundary being the city boundary. Its proposed Gillmoss ward would contain all the properties bounded by East Lancashire Road, Lower House Lane and Dwerryhouse Lane while the boundary would also run to the rear of properties on the north side of Hollocombe Road and west of Ashwater Road before rejoining Oak Lane and following Croxteth Hall Lane. The proposed boundary would finally run to the north of properties off Coachmans Drive until it reaches the city boundary.

61 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards, with the proposed Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's scheme provided for a different warding arrangement in this area to that of the City Council and offered good levels of electoral equality.

62 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards, with the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards being represented by three

councillors each. The councillors' scheme provided for a different warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council and offered good levels of electoral equality.

63 Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation carried out a local consultation exercise concerning its own area. The Community Federation considered that points upon which consensus was reached were reflected in the City Council's proposed Croxteth ward. It also suggested boundary amendments and a ward name for the existing ward.

64 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. We proposed that the southern boundary of the proposed Warbreck ward should follow the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park as we considered this to be a more easily identifiable boundary and attached to better ground detail. We considered the City Council's proposals for the remainder of this area to utilise identifiable boundaries such as the railway line, Long Lane and Lower House Lane while grouping similar communities in single wards, in particular, the grouping of the entire urban area north of East Lancashire Road, formerly in Fazakerley ward, in the proposed Norris Green ward, as discussed later. We acknowledged the similarity in all three proposed easterly wards but again considered the Council's proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria in that it utilised identifiable boundaries in Croxteth Hall Lane and Dwerryhouse Lane; it also, facilitated the exclusion of the entire urban area both sides of Oak Lane from the proposed Croxteth ward which was supported by Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation.

65 We felt that the local consultation carried out by Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation had merit and noted the support it gave to the Council's proposal for this area. We also noted the additional comments made by the Community Federation but considered the Council's proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria in the north-eastern area as it contained all those properties south of East Lancashire Road, east of Croxteth Hall Lane and Lower House Lane in a single ward therefore promoting a strong community identity. The Community Federation suggested that the existing Croxteth ward be renamed and also stated that many refer to the existing Gillmoss ward area as Croxteth and this has been reflected in the City Council's submission and the draft recommendations.

66 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 6%, 2% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Croxteth and Fazakerley wards and to deteriorate slightly in Warbreck ward to equal the average and vary by 1% and 4% by 2006 respectively.

67 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council objected to the proposed transfer of Walton Hall Park into the proposed Warbreck ward stating that the park had been traditionally associated with County ward.

68 The Liberal Party proposed that Walton Hall Park remain in County ward as it considered the proposed transfer to Warbreck ward to have no meaningful benefit. The Liberal Party also proposed an amendment to the proposed Croxteth ward so that the relatively new Ashwater/Marshgate estate would remain in the proposed Croxteth ward as it would maintain current community ties and use a main road as a boundary.

69 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed an amendment to the draft Croxteth ward, in that the small estate including Marshgate Road, Ashwater Road and surrounding roads should be transferred from the proposed West Derby ward to the proposed Croxteth ward as this area was built on part of the former De La Salle play fields and has always been part of the existing Gillmoss ward.

70 Two local councillors highlighted areas they supported in the proposed Croxteth ward and proposed two boundary amendments to Croxteth ward. The councillors proposed that the small estate including Marshgate Road, Ashwater Road and surrounding roads should be transferred from the proposed West Derby ward to the proposed Croxteth ward. They also proposed that the industrial area north of East Lancashire Road should be transferred to the proposed Croxteth ward.

71 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for this area subject to one amendment. The boundary between the proposed County and Warbreck wards would now follow the perimeter of Walton Hall Park, the park would now be included in the proposed County ward as suggested by the City Council and the Liberal Party. We noted the support for the remainder of the draft recommendations in this area.

72 We noted the proposed amendment to transfer the industrial estate within the proposed Fazakerley ward to the proposed Croxteth ward. We consider this proposed amendment to have merit; however, we consider the East Lancashire Road to be a solid easily identifiable boundary and are content to retain it as part of the final recommendations.

73 We also noted the proposal to transfer the small estate including Marshgate Road, Ashwater Road and surrounding roads from the proposed West Derby ward to the proposed Croxteth ward. We consider this amendment to have merit but propose to retain this area within the proposed West Derby ward as it has its access into this ward and we consider it to have common community links with that area directly south of it and Oak Lane, which is also included in the proposed West Derby ward. This area is also bounded north and east by the rear of its properties providing a solid boundary with the proposed Croxteth ward.

74 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 6%, 2% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Croxteth and Fazakerley wards and to deteriorate slightly in Warbreck ward to equal the average and vary by 1% and 4% by 2006 respectively. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot wards

75 The existing wards of Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot cover the north-eastern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 11%, 29% and 8% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Broadgreen and Dovecot wards while deteriorating in Croxteth ward to vary from the city average by 10%, 6% and 32% respectively by 2006.

76 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Knotty Ash, West Derby and Yew Tree wards being represented by three councillors each. The northern boundary of the City Council's proposed West Derby ward would follow Muirhead Avenue and the rear of properties on the north side of Oak Lane then Croxteth Hall Lane, Deysbrook Lane, Crown Road and Leyfield Road in the east. To the south it would follow Green Lane and Alder Road before following Eaton Road, Barnfield Drive and Mill Lane to the west. The proposed Yew Tree ward boundary would consist of the city boundary to the east and the proposed West Derby ward boundary in the west. The proposed northern boundary would follow Deysbrook Lane and the rear of properties off Coachmans Drive with its southern boundary following East Prescott Road, Youens Way, to the rear of properties on the west side of Grange Avenue and Newbury Way and along Yew Tree Lane.

77 The Council proposed that the Knotty Ash ward's northern boundary should consist of the proposed West Derby and Yew Tree wards' southern boundaries with its eastern boundary being formed by the city boundary. To the south and west the boundary would be formed by the M62, Bowring Park Road and Queens Drive.

78 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Broadgreen, Country Park and Dovecot wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement to that of the City Council and achieved good levels of electoral equality.

79 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Broadgreen, Deysbrook and West Derby Village wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed a similar external boundary to that proposed by the City Council; however, they proposed an alternative internal boundary arrangement.

80 Councillors Hulme and Ousby agreed with the City Council's proposed external boundaries for Knotty Ash, West Derby and Yew Tree wards but submitted an alternative internal boundary which they considered allowed for more compact wards and greater numerical equality of voters.

81 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one minor boundary amendment. We proposed that the boundary between Knotty Ash and West Derby wards should follow Honeys Green Lane and Eaton Road before joining Alder Road. We considered this amendment promoted community identity by grouping all those properties north of Honeys Green Lane and both sides of Blackmoor Drive in a single ward. We also considered the City Council's proposed West Derby ward would promote community identity by grouping the urban area both sides of Oak Lane in a single ward. We did not consider either the Labour Group's or the Councillors' schemes in this area to best satisfy the statutory criteria as they both divided natural communities in the Fincham area and did not utilise the most identifiable boundaries in the area.

82 We noted the similar external boundary for the three proposed wards in this area provided by the City Council and Councillors Marbrow and Firth but due to the City Council's external boundary being locally supported and given that it does not split the community both sides of Oak Lane, we considered the Council's boundary to best satisfy the statutory criteria.

83 We noted the proposal forwarded by Councillors Hulme and Ousby and considered it to have merit while also noting its similarity to the Council's proposal in utilising the same external boundary grouping the three proposed wards and several internal boundaries from East Prescott Road to Honeys Green Lane and following Melwood Road in the north. However, having visited the area we considered the Council's proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area by using more identifiable boundaries in Alder Road and Leyfield Road, uniting properties both sides of Blackmoor Drive and providing excellent levels of electoral equality while respecting local communities.

84 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Knotty Ash, Yew Tree and West Derby wards by 6%, 3% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve slightly in Knotty Ash ward while deteriorating slightly in West Derby ward to vary from the city average by 5% and 3% by 2006 respectively. The electoral variance for Yew Tree ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years.

85 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council supported our amended boundary between the proposed Knotty Ash and West Derby wards.

86 The Liberal Party proposed an amendment to the proposed Croxteth ward so that the relatively new Ashwater/Marshgate estate would remain in the proposed Croxteth ward as it would maintain current community ties and use a main road as a boundary, as outlined earlier. The Liberal Party welcomed the utilisation of Alder Road as a boundary throughout its length. It also proposed that West Derby ward should be renamed West Derby Village ward.

87 The Liberal Democrat Group proposed an amendment to the draft Croxteth ward, in that the small estate including Marshgate Road, Ashwater Road and surrounding roads should be transferred from the proposed West Derby ward to the proposed Croxteth ward as this area was built on part of the former De La Salle play fields and has always been part of the existing Gillmoss ward, as outlined earlier.

88 A local resident proposed an amendment between the proposed Knotty Ash and West Derby wards. The resident proposed that the boundary at the junction of Queens Drive/Mill Lane should be extended along Queens Drive to Alder Road junction and join up with that part of Alder Road to the east of Eaton Road.

89 Two local councillors highlighted areas they supported in the proposed Croxteth ward and proposed two boundary amendments to Croxteth ward, as detailed earlier.

90 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for this area without amendment. We noted the proposal to include the Ashwater/Marshgate estate in the proposed Croxteth ward and considered this amendment to have merit; however, we propose to retain this area within the proposed West Derby ward as it has its access into this ward and consider it to have common community links with that area immediately opposite it, south of Oak Lane, which is also included in the proposed West Derby ward, as detailed earlier.

91 We noted the local residents' proposed amendment between Knotty Ash and West Derby wards and consider it to have merit; however, in light of the support for the draft recommendations in this area we are content to put them forward as part of our final recommendations.

92 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Knotty Ash, Yew Tree and West Derby wards by 6%, 3% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve slightly in Knotty Ash ward while deteriorating slightly in West Derby ward to vary from the city average by 5% and 3% by 2006 respectively. The electoral variance for Yew Tree ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie wards

93 The existing wards of Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie cover the mid-northern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 4%, 10%, 6% and 11% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield and County wards while deteriorating in Clubmoor and Pirrie wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 3%, 12% and 15% respectively by 2006.

94 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Norris Green ward would be bounded by Lower Lane, Muirhead Avenue East and Parthenon Drive and Lorenzo Drive in the west. The proposed ward would also contain the urban area immediately to the north of East Lancashire Road. Its proposed

Clubmoor ward would be adjacent to the proposed Norris Green ward and share its western boundary. It proposed that the boundary should also follow Walton Hall Avenue and include the urban area on Stopgate Lane while running along Stanley Park Avenue and the railway to the west. The proposed southern boundary would run eastward south of Worcester Drive and along Cherry Lane, Lisburn Lane, Delamain Road and east along Muirhead Avenue until it reached Lorenzo Drive.

95 The City Council's proposed County ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Warbreck ward with the remainder of its boundary following Walton Hall Avenue, Stanley Park Avenue, the Bootle Rail Line and then Spellow Lane and Carisbrooke Road until it reached the city boundary. The proposed Anfield ward would share its north-western boundary with the proposed County ward and run along the Bootle Rail Line, Townsend Lane, Lower Breck Road, west along the south side of Castlewood Road and north along Belmont Road, Oakfield Road and Walton Breck Road until it joins the proposed County ward boundary at Walton Lane.

96 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, Clubmoor, Pirrie and Walton Park wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

97 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, Clubmoor, Norris Green and Walton Park wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

98 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. The northern boundary of the proposed County ward would follow the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park as detailed earlier. We considered the Council's proposals for the remainder of this area utilised good boundaries such as Lower House Lane and Parthenon Drive enabling the urban area north of East Lancashire Road to be included in a single Norris Green ward and the area between East Lancashire Road and Muirhead Avenue to be split east and west forming the proposed Norris Green and Clubmoor wards which we considered to best reflect the communities in the area and it also provided good levels of electoral equality.

99 We noted that there was some similarity between the City Council's and Labour Group's proposed Anfield ward and also between the City Council's and the Councillors' proposed County ward but considered overall that the City Council's scheme best satisfied the statutory criteria in the area as a whole. The City Council's proposed Anfield and County wards provided for excellent electoral equality while grouping similar communities in single wards by utilising boundaries such as the railway line, Stanley Park perimeter, Walton Lane and Walton Breck Road and we considered these wards to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area subject to the aforementioned amendment. We considered this proposed amendment, running along the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park, to tie the boundary to better ground detail while not affecting any electors.

100 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards by 7%, 1%, 3% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards while deteriorating slightly in County ward to vary by 1%, equal the city average, 1% and 3% by 2006 respectively.

101 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council proposed that Walton Hall Park should remain in County ward, as detailed earlier.

102 The Liberal Party proposed an amendment between the proposed Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. The amendment boundary would run to the rear of properties on the north side of Guernsey Road placing the entirety of Guernsey Road and Portelet Road in Old Swan ward. It also proposed an amendment between the proposed Norris Green and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. This amendment would see the seven houses on Londonderry Road and two shops fronting Maiden Lane transferred to Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward.

103 The Liberal Party proposed two amendments between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. The first amendment would transfer the area north of Townsend Lane, from Abbey to Curate Road, into the proposed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward in order to keep that area covered by Townsend Lane Working Group in a single ward. The Liberal Party recognised the impact that its initial amendment would have on electoral equality and as a compensatory measure it proposed that the following streets, Belmont Grove, Celebration Drive, Sunlight Street and Dominion, Ellel Grove, Denton Street and Thurnam Street, Preston Grove and Rocky Lane as far as Rockhouse Street, be transferred to the proposed Anfield ward. It also considered that the community would benefit as these areas are traditionally associated with Anfield ward.

104 The Liberal Party proposed an amendment between the proposed Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, grouping those properties on Portelet Road and Guernsey Road in a single ward. They also considered that Walton Hall Park should remain in the proposed County ward, as detailed earlier. The Liberal Democrat Group proposed an amendment between the proposed Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, as detailed later.

105 Townsend Lane Working Group proposed an amendment between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. The proposed amendment would include the area both sides of Townsend Lane, from Abbey to Curate Road covered by the working group, in a single ward.

106 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to five boundary amendments between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Norris Green and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards and the proposed Warbreck and County wards, as proposed by the City Council, Liberal Party, Liberal Democrat Group or Townsend Lane Working Group.

107 The amendment between the proposed Warbreck and County wards would transfer Walton Hall Park to the proposed County ward as outlined earlier, this change would not affect any electors. The amendment between Norris Green and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards would see those properties on Londonderry Road transferred to Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward which we consider would better reflect local communities and not adversely affect electoral equality.

108 We also propose to adopt the amendments between Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards as proposed by the Liberal Party and Townsend Lane Working Group as we consider these proposals to best satisfy the statutory criteria as they include the area both sides of Townsend Lane in a single ward and return that area north of Rocky Lane to Anfield ward of which it was originally part. We also propose to amend the boundary between the proposed Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards as put forward by the Liberal Party and the Liberal Democrat Group as it unites those properties south of Guernsey Road in a single ward.

109 We consider the proposed amendments to better reflect local communities and utilise good boundaries while not adversely affecting electoral equality and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations. We are also content to put forward the remainder of the draft proposals in this area as part of the final recommendations.

110 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in the proposed Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards by 6%, 1%, 3% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards while deteriorating slightly in County ward to vary by 1%, equal the city average, 1% and 3% by 2006 respectively. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards

111 The existing wards of Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook cover the north-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average to equal the average, 4% and 10% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Tuebrook ward while deteriorating in Kensington and Old Swan wards to vary from the city average by 4%, 3% and 6% respectively by 2006.

112 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards all being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Kensington ward would be based on the current Kensington ward but would include the Phythian estate, bounded by West Derby Road, Low Hill, Edge Lane and Farnworth Street, include the whole of the Fairfield district and all but the Rocky Lane frontage of Newsham Park. Its eastern boundary would be formed by the railway line and to the south it would be formed by Edge Lane.

113 The Council's proposed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward would be broadly based on the current Tuebrook ward and should exclude all but the Rocky Lane frontage of Newsham Park and those parts of the Pinehurst estate north of Townsend Lane while including the triangle bounded by Queens Drive, Mill Bank and Muirhead Avenue. The Council's proposed Old Swan ward boundary would follow the railway line to the west and south while following Mill Lane, Edge Lane and Queens Drive. The proposed northern boundary would run along Lister Drive, Green Lane, Derwent Road East, Derwent Road West and Derby Lane.

114 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

115 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

116 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. We proposed adopting the Councillors' proposed Kensington ward western boundary as it united all the properties on Jubilee Drive in a single ward and we considered this to promote community identity. The Council's proposals for the remainder of this area utilised excellent boundaries such as the railway line, Edge Lane, Queens Drive, Townsend Lane and West Derby Road while grouping similar communities within these boundaries in single wards. We noted the similarities between the City Council's and the Councillors' schemes in this area but considered the Council's scheme to best satisfy the statutory criteria across the three proposed wards and given their position at the centre of the city, these wards also facilitated a good warding arrangement in the surrounding areas.

117 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards would vary from the city average by 3%, 4% and 7% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards, to vary from the city average by 1%, 2% and 2% respectively by 2006.

118 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council supported the boundary between the proposed Central and Kensington & Fairfield wards and also proposed an amendment between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. This proposed amendment would see that area bounded by Orphan Drive, Bootle Rail Line and Rocky Lane transferred to Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward. The City Council also proposed that Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward should be renamed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward in order to better reflect the communities contained within the proposed ward.

119 The Liberal Party proposed three amendments to the proposed Anfield ward and an amendment between the proposed Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, as detailed earlier. It also proposed an amendment between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. The amended boundary would follow Gardeners Drive from its junction with Sheil Road to where it meets Orphan Drive/Lister Drive. This proposal would be in order to group that area covered by Newsham Park Residents Association in a single ward.

120 The Liberal Democrat Group agreed with the City Council's proposed amendment between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards but did not agree with the Liberal Party's proposals for this area to transfer a larger area to the proposed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward. It also proposed that Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward should be renamed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward in order to better reflect the communities contained within the proposed ward.

121 The Liberal Democrat Group also proposed an amendment between the proposed Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards. The amended boundary would run to the rear of properties on the north side of Guernsey Road placing the entirety of Guernsey Road and Portelet Road in Old Swan ward.

122 Townsend Lane Working Group proposed an amendment between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards in order to group the area covered by the working group in a single ward, as outlined earlier.

123 Newsham Park Residents Association proposed an amendment between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards in order to group the area covered by the association in a single ward. The amended boundary would follow Gardeners Drive from its junction with Sheil Road to where it meets Orphan Drive/Lister Drive.

124 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to five boundary amendments between the proposed Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft, Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards and the proposed Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards.

125 We propose amending the boundary between the proposed Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards as put forward by the Liberal Party and Newsham Park Residents Association. The area proposed to be transferred by the City Council and the Liberal Democrat Group is within the larger area proposed to be transferred by the Liberal Party and the local residents association. We consider the transference of this larger area to be justified as it unites that community surrounding the park that is covered by the Newsham Park Residents Association.

126 The amendment between the proposed Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards would group all properties on Guernsey Road and Portelet Road in a single ward as proposed by the Liberal Party and Liberal Democrat Group and we consider this amendment to better reflect the local communities. The proposed amendments between Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards and Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards would be amended as outlined earlier.

127 We also consider that the proposed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward should be renamed Tuebrook & Stoneycroft in order to accurately reflect the proposed wards constituent parts, as put forward by the City Council, Liberal Democrat Group and The Liberal Party.

128 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards would vary from the city average by being equal to the city average, 8% and 7% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards while deteriorating in Kensington & Fairfield ward to vary from the city average by 6%, 1% and 4% respectively by 2006. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall wards

129 The existing wards of Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall cover the north-western area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 18%, 35%, 6% and 48% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Everton and Vauxhall wards while deteriorating in Breckfield and Melrose wards to vary from the city average by 14%, 46%, 22% and 13% respectively.

130 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Kirkdale ward would be bounded by the city boundary to the north and west, with its eastern boundary following Scotland Road, Everton Valley and Walton Lane. The proposed southern ward boundary would follow Leeds Street. The proposed Everton ward boundary would follow Everton Valley, Scotland Road, Byrom Street, Islington, West Derby Road, Belmont Road, Oakfield Road and Walton Breck Road. The ward would feature Everton Park and Everton Brow at its heart.

131 The proposed Central ward would extend eastwards from the waterfront office complexes and the Main Office Area to include much of the main retail area, the London Road retail area and student accommodations and the Kensington Fields area off Kensington/Edge Lane. The boundaries of Leeds Street, Byrom Street and Islington would be used for the northern boundary while to the east and south part of Smithdown Lane, Falkner Street, Myrtle Street, Hardman Street and Renshaw Street would be used as boundaries.

132 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Breckfield, Kirkdale and Scotland Road wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council and achieved good levels of electoral equality.

133 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Breckfield, City and Vauxhall & Kirkdale wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council and achieved good levels of electoral equality.

134 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area with one minor boundary modification. We proposed

adopting the Councillors' proposed Kensington & Fairfield western boundary to include all the properties on Jubilee Drive in a single ward as previously mentioned. We considered the City Council's scheme in the remainder of this area to best satisfy the statutory criteria by utilising excellent boundaries in the form of Walton Breck Road, Kirkdale Road, Leeds Street and West Derby Road while respecting communities within these boundaries and grouping the town centre in a single Central ward. The proposed Everton and Kirkdale wards would be also bounded by easily identifiable main roads and group similar communities together such as the dockside community in the proposed Kirkdale ward. We did not consider any of the other city-wide schemes to better reflect the statutory criteria in this area.

135 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards would vary from the city average by 19%, 5% and 6% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006.

136 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council supported the proposed boundary between Central and Kensington & Fairfield wards.

137 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for this area without amendment. We note the support from the City Council in relation to the draft recommendations in this area and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

138 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards would vary from the city average by 19%, 5% and 6% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton wards

139 The existing wards of Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton cover the eastern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 26%, 45%, 30% and 18% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly in all wards to vary from the city average by 27%, 46%, 31% and 20% respectively.

140 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Childwall, Valley and Woolton wards being represented by three councillors each. The Council proposed that its Valley ward should be bounded by the Trans Pennine Trail as far as Walsingham Road where it proposed that the boundary should follow the rear of the properties on the southern side of the road then along Chelwood Avenue and to the rear of the properties on the north side of Thornton Road until it reached the city boundary. Its proposed Woolton ward would include the majority of the current ward except that its southern boundary would follow Kings Drive and would also include an area in the north-west bounded by Hornby Lane, Druids Cross Road, Gipsy Lane and Woolton Road and an area in the north-east immediately north of Well Lane. The proposed Childwall ward would be bounded in the south-east by the proposed Woolton and Valley ward boundaries while also following the M62 and Edge Lane in the north before running along the railway line and south along Northway South and east on Thingwall Road, before joining Queens Drive until it reaches Woolton Road.

141 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Belle Vale, Calderstones and Childwall wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Belle Vale ward would be identical to that of the City Council's proposed Valley ward as described earlier.

142 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Gateacre wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Belle Vale ward would be the same as the City Council's proposed Valley ward as described earlier.

143 Councillors O'Donoghue and Marshall provided an alternative to the current Netherley and Valley wards within the city. They stated that in all proposals brought forward by the City Council it was intended to merge the existing wards and that this was unacceptable to councillors from both wards. The Councillors' proposal involved having two wards, they proposed new Gateacre East and Gateacre West wards.

144 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to two boundary amendments and one ward name change. We proposed amending the proposed Childwall ward's western boundary to follow the rear of properties on Northway (Nos. 32 to 74). We also proposed amending the boundary between the proposed Childwall and Woolton wards to include all properties north on Well Lane in the proposed Woolton ward. All three city-wide submissions provided the same easterly ward in this area and due to the consensus on the proposed ward name of Belle Vale we proposed this as the ward name, as we considered it would best reflect the local area.

145 We considered the City Council's proposals for the remainder of this area to best satisfy the statutory criteria by utilising strong boundaries such as the Trans Pennine Trail, Queens Drive, Edge Lane, Menlove Avenue and Woolton Road while providing excellent levels of electoral equality and as far as possible grouping the respective Childwall and Woolton communities in single wards.

146 We noted Councillors O'Donoghue and Marshall's alternative for the existing Netherley and Valley wards but did not consider their scheme to be a better option than that forwarded by all three city-wide submissions as their proposal spanned the Trans Pennine Trail and split part of Woolton. It also did not facilitate the adoption of a suitable warding arrangement for the surrounding area. In the absence of current and projected figures for the proposal we endeavoured to find out the electorates for the proposed wards and found they resulted in poorer electoral variances than our draft recommendations.

147 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Woolton wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 1% and 4% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Belle Vale and Woolton wards to equal the city average and vary by 3% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance in Childwall ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years.

148 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council supported the draft recommendations for this area. It is also the strong view of the council that the proposed Belle Vale ward should be named Valley ward.

149 The Liberal Democrat Group considered that the remains of the Chelwood Avenue Estate should be placed in the proposed Belle Vale ward making the name Valley ward more appropriate.

150 A local resident proposed an alternative five ward arrangement for the mid to south of the city which he considered to better satisfy the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. The local resident proposed new Woolton, Allerton, Grassendale, Black Wood (or Calderstones and Gateacre ward) and Mossley Hill wards.

151 The Woolton Society did not consider the reduction in councillors to be justified and proposed an amendment to the proposed Woolton ward northern and southern boundary. The proposed northern boundary would be amended to follow Druids Cross Road, Aldbourne

Avenue, Gateacre Park Drive and Escor Road. The southern boundary would be amended to follow the south side of Woolton Manor, Woolton Wood, across Camp Road, along Speke Road, Manor Road, Manor Way, Hunts Cross Avenue and Halewood Drive.

152 Woolton Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations for Woolton but proposed a boundary amendment to the south of the proposed ward, offering two alternatives, in order to group an area that would have more affiliation to Woolton rather than Hunts Cross, in a single ward. The first alternative boundary would follow Speke Road from High Street to School Lane and School Lane as far as Camphill. The boundary would then follow the parkland perimeter to Hillfoot Road and back along Hillfoot Road to the junction of Allerton Road/Menlove Avenue.

153 The second alternative would follow Speke Road from High Street to Watergate Road and also Woolton Street from High Street to Speke Road. The amendment would also include the properties on High Street at the junction with Woolton Street, following the boundary of Camphill down to Menlove Avenue.

154 Five local residents objected to the proposed Woolton ward boundary. A local councillor supported the proposed ward name, Belle Vale.

155 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to one boundary amendment between the proposed Woolton and Hunts Cross wards. We propose to amend the boundary in accordance with the first alternative offered by Woolton Liberal Democrats as we consider this proposed amendment to better reflect the local community. The proposed boundary would now follow Hillfoot Road, School Lane and Speke Road until it reaches the High Street. We consider this amendment to better reflect the local community as it includes areas and buildings, such as Woolton Town Hall, in the proposed Woolton ward.

156 We note the City Council's suggested name for the proposed Belle Vale, however, in light of the support for the proposed Belle Vale ward name we are content to put it forward as part of the final recommendations.

157 We note the alternative warding arrangement submitted by a local resident for this southern area and consider it to have merit. However, we do not consider it appropriate to put forward a completely revised warding arrangement for this area at Stage Three as it would affect locally supported wards such as the proposed Wavertree, Cressington and Childwall wards.

158 We noted the amendment to the proposed Belle Vale ward by the Liberal Democrat Group and consider it to have merit, however, in the absence of any support and the fact that the proposed Belle Vale ward was proposed in all three city-wide schemes at Stage One we are content to put it forward as part of the final recommendations. We noted the support for the remainder of the draft recommendations in this area and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

159 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Woolton wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 1% and 3% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Belle Vale and Woolton wards to equal the city average and vary by 1% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance in Childwall ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Arundel, Church and Picton wards

160 The existing wards of Arundel, Church and Picton cover the south-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 7%, 45% and 8% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Arundel and Picton wards to vary from the city average by 5% and 1% respectively. The electoral variance in Church ward is expected to remain constant.

161 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Church ward boundary would follow the railway line, Booker Avenue, Yew Tree Road, Menlove Avenue, Druids Cross Road, Hornby Lane and Woolton Road. It would share its northern boundary with the proposed Wavertree ward. The City Council's proposed Picton ward would be similar to the current ward and part of its boundary would comprise Edge Lane and the ward would contain the Wavertree Technology Park. The boundary would also run along Picton Road, Gainsborough Road and Smithdown Road, extending westward to encompass the Edge Hill district and following the railway line and Gainsborough Road to the east. To the south the proposed boundary would follow the lower end of the cemetery, Fern Grove and Lodge Lane.

162 Its proposed Wavertree ward boundary would comprise, in the north and east, the railway line, Northway, Southway, Thingwall Road and Queens Drive. To the west and south it would be formed by the railway line, Allerton Road, Heathfield Road and Woolton Road to Queens Drive. The City Council's proposed Greenbank ward would share its north and eastern boundary with its proposed Picton and Wavertree wards and would also follow Penny Lane and the railway line in the east. Its proposed western boundary would follow Sefton Park Road, Mossley Hill Drive, Carnatic Road, Mossley Hill Road and Rose Lane to the railway line.

163 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Greenbank Park, Picton and Wavertree Green wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

164 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Mossley Hill, Picton, Smithdown and Wavertree wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council.

165 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to two boundary amendments. We proposed amending the boundary between the proposed Wavertree and Childwall wards to include a part of Northway as detailed earlier. We also proposed amending the boundary between the proposed St Michael's and Greenbank wards so that the boundary would follow the rear of properties on Mossley Hill Drive (Nos. 1 to 7). We considered these proposed amendments to further promote the high level of community identity already achieved by the City Council in this area by grouping similar communities in single wards and in the case of Mossley Hill Drive we considered these properties looked towards Sefton Park on a community level. We considered the City Council's proposals to best satisfy the statutory criteria in the remainder of the area by utilising strong boundaries along Queens Drive, the railway line and Edge Lane while uniting the majority of Wavertree and student communities in single wards in the proposed Wavertree and Greenbank wards respectively. The Council's proposed Picton ward would be closely related to the existing Picton ward and groups the similar terraced housing in a single ward therefore promoting community identity. The proposed Church ward utilises the easily identifiable boundaries of the railway line, Woolton Road and Yewtree Road and groups an area with Calderstones Park as a community focus in a single ward.

166 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards would equal the city average and vary by 2%, 9% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Picton ward while deteriorating slightly in Greenbank and Wavertree wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance for the proposed Church ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years.

167 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council proposed an amendment, as a result of representations made by local councillors and a residents association, between the proposed Greenbank and St Michael's wards. The amended boundary would follow Mossley Hill Drive and would transfer those properties on Mossley Hill Drive to the proposed Greenbank ward.

168 The Liberal Party stated that Greenbank ward should encompass the flat blocks overlooking Sefton Park, therefore the new border of St Michael's ward would be the park itself. It also proposed that Wavertree ward should be renamed Wavertree Gardens ward and the proposed Church ward should be renamed Calderstones ward.

169 Gledhill Residents Association proposed that the seven properties on Mossley Hill Drive be included in the proposed Greenbank ward and not St Michael's ward, as proposed at Stage One.

170 The Wavertree Society supported the proposed Wavertree ward and welcomed the use of the proposed Picton and Wavertree ward names. The society also proposed that Church ward should be renamed Calderstones ward.

171 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to one boundary amendment between the proposed Greenbank and St Michael's wards. We propose to amend the boundary so as to include those properties on Mossley Hill Drive in the proposed Greenbank ward as proposed by the City Council and Gledhill Residents Association. We consider this amendment to have been sufficiently argued in that this area on Mossley Hill Drive is better reflected on a community based in being part of the proposed Greenbank ward, we also note the support for this proposal and the fact it is locally proposed.

172 We also noted the proposed ward name changes in this area but we are content that the names put forward in the draft recommendations suitably reflect the local area and are content to endorse them as part of the final recommendations.

173 We noted the local support for the remainder of the draft recommendations in this area, in particular the proposed Wavertree ward, and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

174 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards would equal the city average and vary by 3%, 9% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Picton ward while deteriorating slightly in Greenbank and Wavertree wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 4% and 3% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance for the proposed Church ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown wards

175 The existing wards of Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown cover the west-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city

average by 5%, 20% and 17% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate in all wards to vary from the city average by 24%, 21% and 20% respectively by 2006.

176 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards being represented by three councillors each. The Council proposed that its Riverside ward should comprise the majority of the current Abercromby ward together with the bulk of the existing Dingle ward as far as Dingle Lane. The river would bound one side of the proposed ward and its western boundary would run along Hanover Street, Renshaw Street, Hardeman Street and then to Hope Street. To the east, Park Road would be used as a boundary before departing from it to follow the more easterly line of Windsor Street. The Council's proposed Princes Park ward would comprise the existing Granby ward and a part of the current Abercromby ward, north of Upper Parliament Street. The proposed ward would be bounded by Ullet Road to the south-east, Lodge Lane to the east and Park Road to the south-west.

177 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Granby, Riverside and University wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council and achieved good levels of electoral equality.

178 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed St James' and Toxteth wards being represented by three councillors each. The councillors proposed an alternative warding arrangement in this area to that proposed by the City Council and achieved good levels of electoral equality.

179 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the City Council's proposals for this area without modification. We considered the Council's scheme to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area by grouping the riverside community in the proposed Riverside ward while also proposing a Princes Park ward that grouped a similar community within its strong boundaries that would follow Ullet Road, Lodge Lane and Park Road. We noted the other proposals for this area and considered that they had merit but we felt the Council's scheme best utilised the strong boundaries available in the area while respecting the riverside and Princes Park communities.

180 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards would vary from the city average by 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Riverside ward while deteriorating slightly in Princes Park ward to vary from the city average by 1% and 4% respectively by 2006.

181 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council supported the draft recommendations for this area. The Liberal Party proposed that Riverside ward should be renamed Cathedral or Brunswick ward. The Liberal Democrat Group believed that the original boundary between St Michael's and Riverside ward proposed by the Labour Group should be adopted, as highlighted below. Hope Street Association objected to the proposed splitting between two wards of the Hope Street area.

182 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for this area without amendment. We noted the objection put forward by Hope Street Association, however, we consider Hope Street to be a strong boundary in this area and are content to put this boundary forward as part of the final recommendations. We also noted the Liberal Democrat comment on the boundary between the proposed Riverside and St Michael's wards but are content that the proposed Riverside ward best satisfies the statutory criteria and the boundaries are easily identifiable giving respect to the local community.

183 We noted the proposed ward name change in this area, however, we are content that the proposed Riverside ward name reflects the community within and are content to put this ward name forward as part of the final recommendations.

184 We consider the remainder of the draft recommendations to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area and are content to put them forward as part of the final recommendations.

185 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards would vary from the city average by 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Riverside ward while deteriorating slightly in Princes Park ward to vary from the city average by 1% and 4% respectively by 2006. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale wards

186 The existing wards of Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale cover the south-western area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 34%, 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Dingle ward while deteriorating in Aigburth and Grassendale wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 38% and 18% respectively.

187 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed St Michael's and Sudley wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow Dingle Road, Dingle Lane, Ullet Road as far as Mossley Hill Drive, then Mossley Hill Drive, Aigburth Road and along Jericho Lane to the river. Its proposed Sudley ward boundary would follow Jericho Lane, Mossley Hill Drive, Carnatic Road, Mossley Hill Road, Rose Lane and the railway line to the east. Its southern boundary would run from the river to the rear of Greenaways Special School, along Beechwood Road, Aigburth Road, Ranelagh Drive, Darby Road, Aigburth Hall Road, Brodie Avenue and Booker Avenue to the railway line.

188 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow Royden Way, Ellerman Road, south of Shorefields Village, eastwards at the north of Promenade Gardens, south of Shorefields School site and along the playing field and recreation ground beside Colebroke Road. The boundary would then follow Dingle Lane, Ullet Road, Ullet Walk, Croxteth Drive, Greenbank Drive, Mossley Hill Drive, Aigburth Vale and to the rear of properties off Jericho Lane before finally joining Jericho Lane to the river. The proposed Otterspool ward boundary would be formed by the river, Riversdale Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue, Booker Avenue and Mather Avenue to Rose Lane. The proposed Otterspool ward's northern boundary would be shared by the proposed St Michael's and Greenbank Park wards utilising the majority of Rose Lane.

189 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Otterspool ward's western boundary would follow the river and it would follow the railway line to the east. The northern boundary would comprise Rose Lane, Kylemore Avenue, Mentmore Avenue, Barkhill Road and then run along North Sudley Road to Aigburth Vale. Jericho Lane would form the last part of the boundary to the river. The southern boundary would be shared with the proposed Garston ward boundary. The proposed St Michael's ward boundary would comprise the river, Jericho Lane, Aigburth Vale, and the outer perimeter of Sefton Park in the east and south. To the north, Ullet Road running into Dingle Lane would provide the boundary.

190 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we did not consider any of the proposed schemes to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area and we therefore proposed putting forward our own proposals for this area. Also in order to integrate the two adopted schemes in the north and south of the City together we needed to create our own scheme in the remainder of the area using boundaries put forward under all three city-wide schemes. The proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow the City Council's proposed St Michael's ward boundary, apart from running to the rear of properties on Mossley Hill Drive (Nos. 1 to 7), until it reached Aigburth Road, then it would follow the rear of properties on Jericho Lane as proposed by the Labour Group and to the rear of properties south of Fulwood Park until it reached the river. All three wards proposed in each city-wide scheme were similar but we consider our proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria as it utilises better boundaries in the area and groups communities such as those on Mossley Hill Drive and Jericho Lane in wards into which they have access.

191 We therefore proposed our own Otterspool ward. The proposed Otterspool ward would share its boundary with the proposed St Michael's and Greenbank wards to the north while its southern boundary would be shared with that of the Labour Group's proposed Cressington ward apart from following the railway to the west of the cricket club and to the rear of Greenaways Special School and properties on the south side of Riversdale Road. To the east the boundary would run along the railway line as proposed by the City Council. We considered this ward to best satisfy the statutory criteria for this area as it uses more identifiable boundaries and provides better community identity by grouping properties to the north of Beechwood Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue and west of the railway line in a single ward. Our proposal also provided good levels of electoral equality while facilitating the integration of both adopted schemes and we considered the ward name of Otterspool would best reflect the area.

192 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards would vary from the city average by 8% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 6% and 2% respectively by 2006.

193 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council proposed an amendment between the proposed Greenbank ward and St Michael's wards, as detailed earlier. It also considered that the proposed Otterspool ward should be renamed Mossley Hill ward.

194 The Liberal Party urged the Boundary Committee to use the name Aigburth ward or Aigburth and Mossley Hill ward in place of the proposed Otterspool ward name. It also proposed an amendment between the proposed Greenbank and St Michael's wards, as outlined earlier.

195 The Liberal Democrat Group believed that the original boundary between St Michael's and Riverside ward proposed by the Labour Group should be adopted, as highlighted earlier.

196 Gledhill Residents Association proposed that the seven properties on Mossley Hill Drive be included in the proposed Greenbank ward and not St Michael's ward, as proposed at Stage One, and detailed earlier.

197 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to one amendment between the proposed Greenbank and St. Michael's wards, as outlined earlier.

198 We propose that the proposed Otterspool ward should be renamed Mossley Hill ward in order to better reflect the community contained within the proposed ward, as suggested by the City Council. We note the several ward names suggested for the proposed Otterspool ward but consider the City Council's to best reflect the local area.

199 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Mossley Hill and St Michael's wards would vary from the city average by 8% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 6% and 3% respectively by 2006. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Allerton, St Mary's and Speke wards

200 The existing wards of Allerton, St Mary's and Speke cover the southern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 18%, 13% and 40% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly in all wards to vary from the city average by 19%, 18% and 44% respectively.

201 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed St Mary's, Speke & Hunts Cross and Springwood wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Springwood ward boundary would comprise the railway line, Booker Avenue, Yew Tree Lane, Menlove Avenue, Woolton High Street and Kings Drive. The southern boundary would run to the rear of the properties on the north side of Camphill Road, Winchester Close, Waylands Drive, Speke Road and Greenacre Road. The proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Springwood ward while its eastern and southern boundary would be the city boundary. To the west the boundary would follow Speke Hall Road then through the airport to the river. The Council's proposed St Mary's ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Sudley ward while its eastern boundary would follow the railway line. To the west it would be bounded by the river and Speke Hall Road and the airport would provide its southern boundary.

202 The Labour Group proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Cressington, Speke-Garston and Hunts Cross wards all being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Cressington ward boundary would run along Riversdale Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue, Booker Avenue, Mather Avenue, Woolton Road, the railway line, Seddon Road and Garston Docks while the remainder of the boundary would be formed by the river. The proposed Speke-Garston ward would comprise the area within the railway line in the north and the city boundary to the east and south. It would share its western boundary with the proposed Cressington ward boundary. The Council's proposed Hunts Cross ward boundary would run along the city boundary, the railway line and Mather Avenue. To the north the boundary would follow the Trans Pennine Trail, the Nook, Halewood Road, Gateacre Brow, Acrefield Road, Woolton Street, High Street, Allerton Road and Woolton Golf Course.

203 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Calderstones, Garston and Woodend wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Calderstones ward is centred around Calderstones Park and its northern, eastern and southern borders are shared with the proposed Garston, Gateacre and Woodend wards. The railway line, Rose Lane and Allerton Road would form the western border and the ward boundary would also comprise Menlove Avenue and Druids Cross Lane. The proposed Garston ward boundary is formed by the river in the south while its eastern border is defined by the proposed Woodend ward. To the north the boundary runs along the railway line, Brunt Lane, Woolton Road, Springwood Avenue and Mather Avenue with the western boundary running between Grassendale and Garston. The Councillors' proposed Woodend ward is the same as the City Council's proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward.

204 Allerton Liberal Democrats objected to the inclusion of Hunts Cross with Speke in a single ward arguing that it did not reflect communities of interest and the City Council's proposed ward would remove the Hunts Cross area from its traditional community links with Allerton and Woolton areas. Allerton Liberal Democrats highlighted the links between the areas of Speke and Garston which it proposed including in a single ward bounded by the city boundary and the

railway line in the north, Garston Way and west to the river before Dock Road. They also emphasised the significant physical barriers of a dual carriageway and industrial estate between Hunts Cross and Speke areas.

205 Hunts Cross Residents Association objected to the City Council's proposed inclusion of Hunts Cross with Speke in a single ward and cited the same reasons as that of Allerton Liberal Democrats arguing that it did not reflect communities of interest and that it crossed physical barriers. The Residents Association supported Map C6, upon which the Labour Group scheme was based, which grouped Speke with Garston and retained the Hunts Cross and Woolton area link. A petition signed by a large number of local residents which opposed being linked with Speke area was also forwarded by the Residents Association. We received 418 representations from local Hunts Cross residents who also opposed being grouped in a ward with Speke and cited the aforementioned issues as reasons.

206 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we proposed adopting the Labour Group's proposed Speke-Garston and Cressington wards with a minor modification. We put forward our own Hunts Cross ward using boundaries put forward in the City Council and Labour Group city-wide schemes. We proposed amending the proposed Speke-Garston ward's western boundary with the proposed Cressington ward to include all the properties south of the railway line and east of Garston Way which we consider will provide better community identity by grouping all these properties in a single Speke-Garston ward. The proposed Hunts Cross ward boundary would follow those boundaries suggested by the City Council; however, in the south it would follow the railway line the entire way to the city boundary and its western boundary would run along Mather Avenue as proposed by the Labour Group.

207 We were persuaded by the argumentation stating that there are no community links between Hunts Cross and Speke areas and we considered that the proposed Speke-Garston ward best satisfied the statutory criteria in this area as it utilised strong boundaries such as the railway line and it facilitated the retention of having Hunts Cross in a single ward with Allerton which we considered to be similar communities. The proposed ward would also be similar to that proposed by Allerton Liberal Democrats. We noted the City Council and Councillors' scheme for this southern area but did not consider these proposals satisfied the statutory criteria in that they grouped separate communities together which are divided by strong natural boundaries and an industrial estate, in a single ward. In light of the proposed southern warding arrangement receiving a large quantity of local support from Hunts Cross residents we were content to put them forward as part of our draft recommendations.

208 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Cressington, Hunts Cross and Speke-Garston wards would vary by 1%, 1% and 10% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to equal the average, equal the average and vary by 4% respectively by 2006.

209 In response to the draft recommendations the City Council highlighted the clear need to address the principles behind our proposals in this area and to assess them against both the electoral review criteria and the City Council's own justification for its proposed ward configuration in this area. The City Council considered there to be more persuasive arguments for combining Hunts Cross and Speke rather than Garston and Speke. The Council highlighted the fact that Hunts Cross was geographically closer to Speke and our proposal detaches the southern part of Garston from a wider consolidated residential area.

210 The City Council also argued its proposal on community ties highlighting the division of the Garston area between the proposed Cressington and Speke-Garston wards and the impact of this on surrounding communities in Hunts Cross, Allerton and Woolton.

211 The City Council considered our draft recommendations in this area to impact on the ability of elected members to carry out effective and convenient local government and that good

government is likely to be further compromised because of the characteristics of the areas involved. It also stated the impractical nature of the ward due to its geographical size.

212 The City Council, in relation to identifiable boundaries, argued that the draft recommendations have clear deficiencies in comparison with those proposed by the City Council, in particular the use of Mather Avenue rather than the main rail line, the use of Hunts Cross city centre rail line and the rear of properties on Fulwood Park/Jericho Lane. It also highlighted the fact that its proposals result in better levels of electoral equality for this area as a whole.

213 The Liberal Party believed the City Council's original proposal for the south of the city to be the best fit. It considered the Council's proposed Garston or St Mary's ward to provide a natural community and that Hunts Cross should be aligned with Speke. The Liberal Party also stated that it had reservations about placing the socially deprived areas of Garston and Speke in a single ward as it would create a disproportionate workload on one group of councillors to the detriment of both communities.

214 The Liberal Party also suggested an amendment between the proposed Speke-Garston and Cressington wards should the Boundary Committee prefer its draft recommendations. It proposed that the triangle, White Edge Road, Belper Street should be transferred to Cressington ward to provide a better population balance. The Liberal Party also suggested that the proposed Cressington ward should be renamed Grassendale ward and the proposed Hunts Cross ward should be renamed Allerton ward.

215 The Liberal Democrat Group considered the proposed Speke-Garston ward to make no sense in terms of community or size. It believed there to be an argument for Speke to have a ward of its own but did not consider there to be an argument for splitting the community of Garston to add numbers of voters to Speke. The Liberal Democrat Group stated that a fallback position may be to include the whole of the current St Mary's ward with Speke as it would at least assure some continuity for Garston.

216 The Labour Group supported the draft recommendations for this area and reiterated its original arguments put forward at Stage One for the proposed Speke-Garston ward.

217 Allerton Liberal Democrats supported the draft recommendations for the Hunts Cross area and highlighted its links with Woolton and Allerton and also the physical separation this area has from Speke. Allerton & Hunts Cross Conservative Association supported the proposal not to link Hunts Cross with Speke but was disappointed with the proposed splitting of the Jewish community on Booker Avenue and Mather Avenue. It also queried the inclusion of a development in the proposed Hunts Cross ward. Liberal Democrats Grassendale Ward supported the proposed Cressington ward.

218 A local resident proposed an alternative five ward arrangement for the south of the city which he considered to better satisfy the statutory criteria. The local resident proposed new Woolton, Allerton, Grassendale, Black Wood (or Calderstones and Gateacre ward) and Mossley Hill wards, as highlighted earlier.

219 We received submissions from three local councillors objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. One of the councillors proposed a Speke ward that included neither Hunts Cross or any part of Garston. Both other local councillors urged the Boundary Committee to revert to the City Council's alternative proposals for this area and attached supporting petitions. We received a petition from St Mary's Liberal Democrats which objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward and supported the City Council's proposals for this area. We received another petition from Garston & District Community Council which objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Speke/Garston Tenants Group objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Two Loyal Orange Institutions of England objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Seven

local Garston residents objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward with two residents urging the Boundary Committee to accept the City Council's proposals for this area. Riverside Credit Union supported the proposed Speke-Garston ward. Meads Residents Association objected to the proposed Hunts Cross ward and would like Allerton to have its own community based ward as at present.

220 We received a submission from two local Speke councillors objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward, the councillors also supported the City Council's alternative proposals for the southern area of the city. Speke Action Group submitted a petition objecting to the proposed Speke-Garston ward and in support of the City Council's alternative proposals for the southern area of the city. A local resident objected to the proposed Speke-Garston ward.

221 We received representations from 257 local Hunts Cross residents in support of the proposed Hunts Cross ward. One local resident would like no change to the existing boundaries in the south of the city.

222 Having considered the representations received carefully, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendation for this area subject to one amendment between the proposed Hunts Cross and Woolton wards, as outlined earlier.

223 We note the City Council's comments and argumentation submitted at Stage Three for this area and the support it has received. We consider its points to be well argued and its case for change in this area is very strong. We understand the points it has raised in relation to the draft recommendations and in considering the statutory criteria. However, we cannot consider any area in isolation and any extensive change in this area would result in a knock on effect to change wards that are locally supported. We are also still of the opinion that the draft recommendations offer the best balance between all the statutory criteria as they utilise strong boundaries, provide a good level of electoral equality and, having visited the area, groups similar communities in single wards. We consider the grouping of Garston and Speke in the context of the entire southern warding arrangement to best satisfy the statutory criteria than the alternatives provided. We noted the Liberal Party's proposal to combine the existing Speke and St Mary's wards but, upon closer investigation, found this ward to result in an electoral variance that far exceeded 10%. We also investigated the possibility of retaining Speke in ward of its own but this alternative also resulted in a ward exceeding a variance of 10%.

224 We noted the volume of local reaction to our draft recommendations in the south of the city, in particular the proposed Speke-Garston and Hunts Cross wards. We noted the opposition from local Speke and Garston councillors and residents to the proposed Speke-Garston ward while the City Council argued that its proposed warding arrangement for this area better satisfied the statutory criteria. We also noted the support from local residents for the proposed Hunts Cross ward.

225 We considered the arguments put forward for this area in detail and acknowledge the fact that there are three very distinct communities in this southern area of the city and that two must be paired together in order to achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality. Having considered the evidence we remain convinced that our draft recommendations provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We consider the alternatives proposed to have merit but in order to adopt an alternative arrangement for this area would involve a redrawing of wards in the southern area which would affect surrounding wards that have been locally supported. We also remain of the opinion that Hunts Cross is a separate community in relation to Speke and Garston and would not look southward on a community basis. We acknowledge the fact that the areas of Speke and Garston have their individual characteristics but in respect of the statutory criteria consider this pairing to provide a better balance than any other alternative available.

226 We note the local support for the proposed Cressington ward and are content to put it forward as part of our final recommendations for the southern area.

227 We note the alternative warding arrangement submitted by a local resident for this southern area and consider it to have merit. However, we do not consider it appropriate to put forward a completely revised warding arrangement for this area at Stage Three as it would affect locally supported wards, as highlighted earlier.

228 We consider that the proposed Hunts Cross ward should be renamed Allerton & Hunts Cross in order to better reflect the constituent parts of the proposed ward.

229 Under our final recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Cressington, Allerton & Hunts Cross and Speke-Garston wards would vary by 1%, 3% and 10% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to equal the city average and vary by 2% and 4% respectively by 2006. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A.

Electoral cycle

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

Conclusions

231 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse those draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- we propose amendments between Warbreck and County wards, Anfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft, Clubmoor and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards and between Kensington & Fairfield and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards;
- we propose further amendments between Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneycroft wards, Greenbank and St Michael's wards and between Woolton and Hunts Cross wards;
- we also propose that Tuebrook & Stoneyford ward should be named Tuebrook & Stoneycroft ward, Otterspool ward should be renamed Mossley Hill ward and Hunts Cross ward should be renamed Allerton & Hunts Cross ward.

232 We conclude that, in Liverpool City:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 99 to 90;
- there should be 30 wards, three fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified.

233 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	99	90	99	90
Number of wards	33	30	33	30
Average number of electors per councillor	3,439	3,783	3,424	3,766
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	20	2	22	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	11	0	13	0

234 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 20 to two, with no wards varying by more than 20% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality would improve further by 2006, with no ward varying by more than 6% from the average. We conclude that our final recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final recommendation

Liverpool City Council should comprise 90 councillors, serving 30 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A and the large maps.

Map 2: Final recommendations for Liverpool

6 What happens next?

235 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Liverpool and submitted our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692).

236 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 6 May 2003, and The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by that date. They particularly welcome any comments on the first draft of the Order, which will implement the new arrangements.

237 All further correspondence concerning our recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to:

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

**Fax: 020 7271 0667
Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose)**

Appendix A

Final recommendations for Liverpool City: detailed mapping

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

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries for the Liverpool City area.

The **large maps** illustrate the proposed warding arrangements for Liverpool City.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Liverpool: Key map

Appendix B

Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order

Preamble

This describes the process by which the Order will be made, and under which powers. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decide not to modify the Final recommendations.

Citation and commencement

This defines the name of the Order and sets the dates on which it will come into force.

Interpretation

This defines terms that are used in the Order.

Wards of the city of Liverpool

This abolishes the existing wards, and defines the names and areas of the new wards, in conjunction with the map and the schedule.

Elections of the council of the city of Liverpool

This sets the date on which a whole council election will be held to implement the new wards, and the dates on which councillors will retire.

Maps

This requires Liverpool City Council to make a print of the map available for public inspection.

Electoral registers

This requires Liverpool City Council to adapt the electoral register to reflect the new wards.

Revocation

This revokes the Order that defines the existing wards, with the exception of the articles that established the system of election by thirds.

Explanatory note

This explains the purpose of each article. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decide not to modify the Final recommendations.

Appendix C

First draft of electoral change Order

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2003 No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The City of Liverpool (Electoral Changes) Order 2003

Made - - - - 2003

Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)

Whereas the Boundary Committee for England(**a**), acting pursuant to section 15(4) of the Local Government Act 1992(**b**), has submitted to the Electoral Commission(**c**) recommendations dated March 2003 on its review of the city(**d**) of Liverpool:

And whereas the Electoral Commission have decided to give effect [with modifications] to those recommendations:

And whereas a period of not less than six weeks has expired since the receipt of those recommendations:

Now, therefore, the Electoral Commission, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sections 17(**e**) and 26(**f**) of the Local Government Act 1992, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, hereby make the following Order:

Citation and commencement

- 1.—(1) This Order may be cited as the City of Liverpool (Electoral Changes) Order 2003.
- (2) This Order shall come into force –
 - (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to any election to be held on 6th May 2004, on 15th October 2003;
 - (b) for all other purposes, on 6th May 2004.

a(a) The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, established by the Electoral Commission in accordance with section 14 of the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c. 41). The Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (S.I. 2001/3962) transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Local Government Commission for England.

(b) 1992 c.19. This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.

(c) The Electoral Commission was established by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c. 41). The functions of the Secretary of State, under sections 13 to 15 and 17 of the Local Government Act 1992, to the extent that they relate to electoral changes within the meaning of that Act, were transferred with modifications to the Electoral Commission on 1st April 2002 (S.I. 2001/3962).

(d) The metropolitan district of Liverpool has the status of a city.

(e) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962 and also otherwise in ways not relevant to this Order.

(f) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.

Interpretation

2. In this Order –

“city” means the city of Liverpool;

“existing”, in relation to a ward, means the ward as it exists on the date this Order is made; and

any reference to the map is a reference to the map marked “Map referred to in the City of Liverpool (Electoral Changes) Order 2003”, of which prints are available for inspection at –

- (a) the principal office of the Electoral Commission; and
- (b) the offices of Liverpool City Council.

Wards of the city of Liverpool

3.—(1) The existing wards of the city(**g**) shall be abolished.

- (2) The city shall be divided into thirty wards which shall bear the names set out in the Schedule.
- (3) Each ward shall comprise the area designated on the map by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by red lines; and the number of councillors to be elected for each ward shall be three.
- (4) Where a boundary is shown on the map as running along a road, railway line, footway, watercourse or similar geographical feature, it shall be treated as running along the centre line of the feature.

Elections of the council of the city of Liverpool

4.—(1) Elections of all councillors for all wards of the city shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004(**h**)(**i**).

- (2) The councillors holding office for any ward of the city immediately before 10th May 2004 shall retire on that date and the newly elected councillors for those wards shall come into office on that date.
- (3) Of the councillors elected in 2004 one shall retire in 2006, one in 2007 and one in 2008.
- (4) Of the councillors elected in 2004 –
 - (a) the first to retire shall, subject to paragraphs (6) and (7), be the councillor elected by the smallest number of votes; and
 - (b) the second to retire shall, subject to those paragraphs, be the councillor elected by the next smallest number of votes.
- (5) In the case of an equality of votes between any persons elected which makes it uncertain which of them is to retire in any year, the person to retire in that year shall be determined by lot.
- (6) If an election of councillors for any ward is not contested, the person to retire in each year shall be determined by lot.
- (7) Where under this article any question is to be determined by lot, the lot shall be drawn at the next practicable meeting of the council after the question has arisen and the drawing shall be conducted under the direction of the person presiding at the meeting.

(**g**) See the City of Liverpool (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979 (S.I. 1979/1411).

(**h**) Article 4 provides for a single election of all the councillors and for reversion to the system of election by thirds, as established by articles 8 and 9(7) of S.I. 1979/1411.

(**i**) For the ordinary day of election of councillors of local government areas, see section 37 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2), amended by section 18(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1985 (c.50) and section 17 of, and paragraphs 1 and 5 of Schedule 3 to, the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (c.29).

Maps

5. Liverpool City Council shall make a print of the map marked “Map referred to in the City of Liverpool (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979” available for inspection at its offices by any member of the public at any reasonable time.

Electoral registers

6. The Electoral Registration Officer(j) for the city shall make such rearrangement of, or adaptation of, the register of local government electors as may be necessary for the purposes of, and in consequence of, this Order.

Revocation

7. The City of Liverpool (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979(k) is revoked, save for articles 8 and 9(7).

Signed by the members of the Electoral Commission

Date *Pamela Gordon*
Commissioner

Date *Glyn Mathias*
Commissioner

Date *Neil McIntosh*
Commissioner

Date *Karamjit Singh*
Commissioner

Date *Sam Younger*
Commissioner

Date *Graham Zellick*
Commissioner

j(j) As to electoral registration officers and the register of local government electors, see sections 8 to 13 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2).
k(k) S.I. 1979/1411.

SCHEDULE
NAMES OF WARDS

article 3

Allerton and Hunts Cross
Anfield
Belle Vale
Central
Childwall
Church
Clubmoor
County
Cressington
Croxteth
Everton
Fazakerley
Greenbank
Kensington and Fairfield
Kirkdale
Knotty Ash
Mossley Hill
Norris Green
Old Swan
Picton
Princes Park
Riverside
St Michael's
Speke-Garston
Tuebrook and Stoneycroft
Warbreck
Wavertree
West Derby
Woolton
Yew Tree

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Order)

This Order gives effect, [with modifications], to recommendations by the Boundary Committee for England, a committee of the Electoral Commission, for electoral changes in the city of Liverpool.

The modifications are *indicate the modifications*.

The changes have effect in relation to local government elections to be held on and after 6th May 2004.

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the city and provides for the creation of 30 new wards. That article and the Schedule also make provision for the names and areas of, and numbers of councillors for, the new wards.

Article 4 makes provision for a whole council election in 2004 and for reversion to the established system of election by thirds in subsequent years.

Article 6 obliges the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary amendments to the electoral register to reflect the new electoral arrangements.

Article 7 revokes the City of Liverpool (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979, with the exception of articles 8 and 9(7).

The areas of the new city wards are demarcated on the map described in article 2. Prints of the map may be inspected at all reasonable times at the offices of Liverpool City Council and at the principal office of the Electoral Commission at Trevelyan House, Great Peter Street, London SW1P 2HW.