

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Kirklees

Report to The Electoral Commission

July 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. 340

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee For England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	13
2 Current electoral arrangements	15
3 Draft recommendations	19
4 Responses to consultation	21
5 Analysis and final recommendations	25
6 What happens next?	47
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Kirklees: Detailed mapping	49
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	51
C First draft of the electoral change Order for Kirklees	53

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 the borough of Kirklees in West Yorkshire.

Summary

We began a review of Kirklees' electoral arrangements on 8 May 2002. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 11 February 2003, 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 Kirklees:

- **In nine of the 24 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the borough, and one ward varies 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 11 wards and by more than 20% in two wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 119 -120) are that:

- **Kirklees Metropolitan Council should have 69 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 23 wards, instead of 24 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries.**

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

- **In 22 of the proposed 23 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the borough average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in only two wards, Holme Valley South and Mirfield, expected to vary by more than 10% from the average for the borough in 2006.**

Recommendations are also made for changes to parish council electoral arrangements which provide for:

- **new warding arrangements for Holme Valley and Kirkburton parishes;**
- **a decrease in the number of councillors for Holme Valley Parish Council.**

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 9 September 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

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1	Almondbury	3	Part of Almondbury ward; the proposed Lepton parish ward of Kirkburton parish; part of Newsome ward.	5
2	Ashbrow	3	Part of Birkby ward; part of Deighton ward.	1, 4 and 5
3	Batley East	3	Part of Batley East ward; part of Batley West ward; part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward; part of Dewsbury East ward.	2
4	Batley West	3	Part of Batley West ward; part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward.	2
5	Birstall & Birkenshaw	3	Part of Batley West ward; part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward; part of Cleckheaton ward; part of Spen ward.	1 and 2
6	Cleckheaton	3	Part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward; part of Cleckheaton ward; part of Spen ward.	1
7	Colne Valley	3	Part of Colne Valley West ward; part of Golcar ward; part of Lindley ward.	3, 4, 7 and 8
8	Crosland Moor & Netherton	3	Part of Crosland Moor ward; part of Newsome ward; part of Paddock ward.	4
9	Dalton	3	Part of Almondbury ward; part of Dalton ward; part of Deighton ward; the proposed Kirkheaton parish ward of Kirkburton parish.	5
10	Denby Dale	3	The parish of Denby Dale.	6, 9 and 10
11	Dewsbury East	3	Part of Batley East ward; part of Dewsbury East ward.	2 and 6
12	Dewsbury South	3	<i>Unchanged</i> – the existing Thornhill ward.	2 and 6
13	Dewsbury West	3	Part of Batley West ward; part of Dewsbury East ward; part of Dewsbury West ward.	2 and 6
14	Golcar	3	Part of Colne Valley West ward; part of Crosland Moor ward; part of Golcar ward; part of Lindley ward; part of Paddock ward.	4
15	Greenhead	3	Part of Birkby ward; part of Deighton ward; part of Paddock ward.	4 and 5
16	Heckmondwike	3	Part of Batley West ward; part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward; part of Heckmondwike ward; part of Spen ward.	1 and 2
17	Holme Valley North	3	The existing Honley West parish ward and the proposed Brockholes, Honley Central & East and Honley South parish wards of Holme Valley parish; the parish of Meltham.	3, 4, 5, 8 and 9
18	Holme Valley South	3	The existing Wooldale parish ward and the proposed Fulstone, Hepworth, Holmfirth Central, Netherthong, Scholes, Upper Holme Valley and Upperrthong parish wards of Holme Valley parish.	7, 8, 9 and 11
19	Kirkburton	3	The existing Flockton, Kirkburton, Shelley, Shepley and Thurstonland & Farnley Tyas parish wards and the proposed Lepton & Whitley Upper parish ward of Kirkburton parish.	5, 6, 9 and 10
20	Lindley	3	Part of Birkby ward; part of Golcar ward; part of Lindley ward; part of Paddock ward.	4
21	Liversedge & Gomersal	3	Part of Cleckheaton ward; part of Heckmondwike ward; part of Spen ward.	1, 2 and 5

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
22	Mirfield	3	The parish of Mirfield.	1, 2, 5 and 6
23	Newsome	3	Part of Almondbury ward; part of Deighton ward; part of Newsome ward; part of Paddock ward.	4

Notes:

- 1) *The south of the borough and Mirfield are the only parished parts of the borough and comprise the seven wards indicated above in the relevant constituent areas.*
- 2) *The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.*

Table 2: Final recommendations for Kirklees

	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	Almondbury	3	12,892	4,297	2	12,995	4332	-2
2	Ashbrow	3	12,802	4,267	1	13,595	4,532	3
3	Batley East	3	12,162	4,054	-4	12,810	4,270	-3
4	Batley West	3	12,688	4,229	0	13,515	4,505	2
5	Birstall & Birkenshaw	3	12,178	4,059	-4	12,755	4,252	-4
6	Cleckheaton	3	12,087	4,029	-5	12,924	4,308	-2
7	Colne Valley	3	12,555	4,185	-1	13,080	4,360	-1
8	Crosland Moor & Netherton	3	12,701	4,234	0	13,233	4,411	0
9	Dalton	3	12,548	4,183	-1	12,896	4,299	-3
10	Denby Dale	3	12,082	4,027	-5	12,396	4,132	-6
11	Dewsbury East	3	12,605	4,202	-1	13,023	4,341	-2
12	Dewsbury South	3	12,221	4,074	-4	13,191	4,397	0
13	Dewsbury West	3	11,771	3,924	-7	12,758	4,253	-4
14	Golcar	3	12,884	4,295	2	13,606	4,535	3
15	Greenhead	3	13,305	4,435	5	13,375	4,458	1
16	Heckmondwike	3	12,173	4,058	-4	12,931	4,310	-2
17	Holme Valley North	3	12,423	4,141	-2	13,139	4,380	-1
18	Holme Valley South	3	13,525	4,508	7	14,662	4,887	11
19	Kirkburton	3	12,309	4,103	-3	12,953	4,318	-2
20	Lindley	3	13,182	4,394	4	13,816	4,605	4
21	Liversedge & Gomersal	3	12,885	4,295	2	13,214	4,405	0
22	Mirfield	3	14,707	4,902	16	14,961	4,987	13
23	Newsome	3	12,746	4,429	1	12,838	4,279	-3
	Totals	69	291,431	-	-	304,666	-	-
	Averages	-	-	4,224	-	-	4,415	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Kirklees Metropolitan 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 borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1 Introduction

1 This report contains our final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the borough of Kirklees in West Yorkshire. We are reviewing the five metropolitan boroughs in West Yorkshire 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 Kirklees. Kirklees' last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in July 1979 (Report No. 344).

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.
- the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1996 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to:
 - eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
 - promote equality of opportunity; and
 - promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

4 Details of the local government legislation under which the review of Kirklees 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 which can be returned from each metropolitan borough ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan borough 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 8 May 2002, when we wrote to Kirklees Metropolitan Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified West Yorkshire Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Yorkshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the borough, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire & Humber Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Kirklees Metropolitan Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 11 February 2003 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Kirklees*, and ended on 7 April 2003. 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 borough of Kirklees covers some 41,230 hectares, has a population of just over 395,131 and contains five parishes. Kirklees is bounded by the boroughs of Calderdale to the west, Bradford and Leeds to the north, Wakefield to the east and Oldham, High Peak and Barnsley to the south. It is the largest borough council in England that is not based on a single large town or city. The borough was formed in the local government reorganisation of 1974 from 11 existing urban districts, metropolitan and county boroughs. Over two-thirds of Kirklees is rural, with moorland and valleys of the Peak District and South Pennines.

12 The electorate of the borough is 291,434 (December 2001). The Council presently has 72 members who are elected from 24 wards, five of which are relatively rural in the south of the borough and the remainder being predominantly urban. All wards are three-member wards.

13 At present, each councillor represents an average of 4,048 electors, which the Metropolitan Council forecasts will increase to 4,231 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 nine of the 24 wards varies by more than 10% from the borough average and in one ward by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in Deighton ward where each of the three councillors represents 30% fewer electors than the borough average.

14 To compare levels of electoral inequality between wards, we calculated, in percentage terms, the extent to which the number of electors per councillor in each ward (the councillor:elector ratio) varies from the borough 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 Kirklees

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 Almondbury	3	9,907	3,302	-18	9,944	3,315	-22
2 Batley East	3	12,759	4,253	5	13,626	4,542	7
3 Batley West	3	13,304	4,435	10	14,100	4,700	11
4 Birkby	3	11,722	3,907	-3	12,032	4,011	-5
5 Birstall & Birkenshaw	3	13,448	4,483	11	14,101	4,700	11
6 Cleckheaton	3	11,570	3,857	-5	12,406	4,135	-2
7 Colne Valley West	3	10,554	3,518	-13	11,077	3,692	-13
8 Crosland Moor	3	11,757	3,919	-3	12,404	4,135	-2
9 Dalton	3	11,687	3,896	-4	12,099	4,033	-5
10 Deighton	3	8,503	2,834	-30	9,207	3,069	-27
11 Denby Dale	3	14,366	4,789	18	14,661	4,887	15
12 Dewsbury East	3	11,246	3,749	-7	11,723	3,908	-8
13 Dewsbury West	3	12,766	4,255	5	13,479	4,493	6
14 Golcar	3	12,810	4,270	5	13,487	4,496	6
15 Heckmondwike	3	13,469	4,490	11	14,278	4,759	12
16 Holme Valley North	3	12,423	4,141	2	13,139	4,380	4
17 Holme Valley South	3	13,525	4,508	11	14,662	4,887	15
18 Kirkburton	3	13,805	4,602	14	14,294	4,765	13
19 Lindley	3	12,919	4,306	6	13,503	4,501	6
20 Mirfield	3	12,404	4,135	2	12,766	4,255	1
21 Newsome	3	10,760	3,587	-11	10,567	3,522	-17
22 Paddock	3	11,214	3,738	-8	11,255	3,752	-11
23 Spennings	3	12,295	4,098	1	12,666	4,222	0
24 Thornhill	3	12,221	4,074	1	13,191	4,397	4
Totals	72	291,434	-	-	304,667	-	-
Averages	-	-	4,048	-	-	4,231	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Kirklees Metropolitan Council.

Note: 1) The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Deighton ward were relatively over-represented by 30%, while electors in Denby Dale ward were significantly under-represented by 18%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

2) There is a small anomaly in the electorate figures supplied between the total electorate data for 2001 and 2006 shown in Table 2 and Table 4. This is due to rounding.

3 Draft recommendations

15 During Stage One 62 representations were received, including two borough-wide schemes from the Green, Labour and Liberal Democrat groups on the Council (the 'Joint Submission'), and from the Conservative Group on the Council. Representations were also received from four parish or town councils, five local organisations, 12 borough councillors, the Mayor of Mirfield and 38 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 Kirklees*.

16 Our draft recommendations were based on the Joint Submission's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality so that just two wards would vary by more than 10% from the borough average number of electors per councillor by 2006. However, we moved away from the Joint Submission's scheme in a number of areas, using some of our own proposals. We proposed that:

- Kirklees Metropolitan Council should be served by 69 councillors, compared with the current 72, representing 23 wards, one less than at present;
- the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified, while one ward should retain its existing boundaries;
- there should be new warding arrangements for Holme Valley parish, with new parish ward boundaries and a reduction in the number of councillors serving the parish from 31 to 23;
- Kirkburton parish ward boundaries should be amended, though it should be represented by the same number of parish councillors.

Draft recommendation

Kirklees Metropolitan Council should comprise 69 councillors, serving 23 wards.

17 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 22 of the 23 wards varying by no more than 10% from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, with only two wards (Holme Valley South and Mirfield) varying by more than 10% from the average by 2006.

4 Responses to consultation

18 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 200 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 Kirklees Metropolitan Council.

Kirklees Metropolitan Council Joint Submission

19 The Joint Submission of three of the four groups on the Council (the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups), whose Stage One proposals we broadly adopted as our draft recommendations, generally supported our draft recommendations. However, it submitted eight minor amendments to either tie boundaries to clearer ground detail, or better reflect communities. The amendments put forward by the Joint Submission would affect Batley East, Crosland Moor, Dewsbury East, Greenhead, Holme Valley North and Newsome wards, and small numbers of electors.

Kirklees Conservative Group

20 The Conservative Group expressed disappointment that The Boundary Committee decided not to adopt its Stage One proposals based on a council size of 72. It supported the draft recommendations for Colne Valley West, Crosland Moor, Denby Dale, Dewsbury South, Dewsbury West, Golcar, Heckmondwike, Holme Valley North, Holme Valley South, Lindley and Mirfield wards. However, the Conservative Group submitted a number of fairly substantial alternative proposals for the remainder of the borough. Most significantly, it proposed that Kirkburton parish should not be split over three wards, but instead over two, and therefore proposed new Kirkburton North and Kirkburton South wards. The knock-on effect of the creation of these wards caused the Conservative Group to propose four new Huddersfield wards.

Parish councils

21 Denby Dale Parish Council fully agreed with the draft recommendations for Denby Dale ward.

22 Holme Valley Parish Council noted some anomalies with its parish boundaries, however, members could not come to a conclusion as to the most suitable resolution, and therefore decided not to recommend any change to our draft recommendations for the parish.

23 Kirkburton Parish Council regretted that The Boundary Committee did not adopt its Stage One proposal to divide its parish between two, rather than three, wards. It also argued that our draft recommendations divided the village of Lepton. The Parish Council therefore proposed that its original submission be re-considered.

Other representations

24 A further 195 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local political groups, organisations, councillors and residents.

25 Batley East Liberal Democrats expressed concern regarding the draft recommendations for the Hanging Heaton area of Batley, as well as other concerns regarding Batley East and Dewsbury East wards.

26 Paddock Community Forum put forward amendments for the boundaries of Crosland Moor, Golcar, Greenhead and Newsome wards. Highfields Community Residents' Association put

forward two options to amend the boundary between Greenhead and Newsome wards, to create a clearer boundary.

27 Kirkburton and District Civic Society supported the draft recommendations for Mirfield and Denby Dale wards, as well as the inclusion of Shelley in the Kirkburton ward. However, the society expressed disappointment that Kirkburton parish would continue to be fragmented over three wards, and that Lepton would be transferred into Almondbury ward. It stated that it would prefer that the parish be split over two wards, and the historic links maintained.

28 Councillor Pandor put forward two minor amendments to the boundary between Batley East and Batley West wards in order to better reflect community identity.

29 Councillors Rutter and Sarwar argued that Crosland Moor ward should be renamed Crosland Moor & Netherton ward.

30 Two local residents expressed concern regarding the draft recommendations for Almondbury and Kirkburton wards. They objected to the proposal which would place part of Lepton in Almondbury ward, and stated that Lepton has links with Kirkburton, not Almondbury.

31 A local resident questioned the need for a review and stated that the draft proposal to transfer Roberttown from Heckmondwike ward into Liversedge ward would result in the loss of the good relationship between Roberttown and Heckmondwike. Another local resident broadly supported the draft recommendations, but proposed three minor changes to Heckmondwike, Liversedge, and Oakwell wards, to include all of Gomersal and Heckmondwike villages in the same wards. He also proposed that Liversedge ward be renamed Liversedge & Gomersal ward.

32 A local resident objected to the draft recommendation to transfer Salendine Nook from Lindley ward to Golcar ward, arguing that Salendine Nook has nothing in common with Golcar. Another local resident stated that the whole of Blackmoorfoot hamlet should be included within Colne Valley West ward.

33 Councillor Andrews supported the draft recommendation for a council size of 69 and 23 wards, as well as the new Mirfield ward. However, he expressed disappointment that his proposal to reduce the number of wards to 20 was not adopted, and questioned the projected electorate figures for Mirfield.

34 Councillor Denham opposed the draft recommendation to transfer the Castle Hill area of Almondbury ward into Newsome ward, and included a 181-signature petition in support of the area remaining in Almondbury ward. Almondbury (Lumb) Civic Associates expressed concern regarding the same draft recommendation, and stated that Castle Hill is an 'integral' part of the village, and should remain in Almondbury ward. Almondbury (Castle Hill) Civic Associates expressed disappointment regarding the proposed transfer of the Castle Hill area out of Almondbury ward, as the area has no connection with Newsome. Eleven local residents also objected to the transfer of Castle Hill into Newsome ward, which they stated would not make sense as the area has strong historical links with Almondbury.

35 Batley & Spen Conservative Association strongly objected to the draft recommendation to change the name of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward to Oakwell, stating that the proposal would airbrush Birstall & Birkenshaw off the map. Councillors Palfreeman and Light, Birstall Central Tenants and Residents Association, Fieldhead Tenants & Residents Association and Birstall Village Improvement Group all strongly opposed the new ward name of Oakwell, and along with 19 local residents called for the existing name of Birstall & Birkenshaw to be retained. Two of the local residents each submitted a 51-signature petition and a 21-signature petition, which both objected to the proposed ward name of Oakwell.

36 Councillors J.Taylor and K.Taylor and Mirfield Civic Society supported the draft recommendation to re-unite Mirfield as one ward. 141 local residents also supported this draft recommendation, and opposed the Conservative Group's Stage One proposals for Mirfield. One local resident supported the Conservative proposal to link Lower Hopton with Kirkheaton.

5 Analysis and final recommendations

37 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Kirklees is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended) which stipulates: 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 must also 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 increase of approximately 8% in the electorate of Kirklees. The Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 5% from 291,434 to 304,667 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Cleckheaton, Deighton, Holme Valley South and Thornhill wards, although it predicted a decline in the electorate in Newsome ward. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

42 Having accepted that forecasting electorates 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.

43 During Stage Three, Mirfield Town Councillor Andrews questioned the projected electorate figures for Mirfield, and contended that the electorate of Mirfield is likely to increase more quickly than projected, and should therefore be allocated four instead of three councillors. However, the Council were of the view that Councillor Andrews' alternative projections for the Mirfield electorate did not accurately reflect the electorate demographics and actual potential development land available. Therefore, having consulted with the Council regarding Councillor Andrews' comments, we remain satisfied that the Council's figures represent the best estimates currently available.

Council size

44 Kirklees Metropolitan Council presently has 72 members. In the draft recommendations report we adopted the Joint Submission's proposal for a council of 69 members. We considered that the Joint Submission and the Conservative Group's submission both addressed the question of whether their proposed council sizes would provide for convenient and effective local government for Kirklees. We therefore compared the levels of electoral equality under, and community support for, each of the proposals. The Conservative Group's proposals achieved very good levels of electoral equality, with all wards varying by no more than 2% by 2006. The Joint Submission proposals also achieved good levels of electoral equality, notwithstanding the electorates in Holme Valley South and Mirfield wards. However, we noted that there was strong local support for the Joint Submission proposals to transfer Northorpe parish ward from Dewsbury West ward to Mirfield ward and to keep the whole parish in the same ward. We also noted that there were some objections to the Conservative Group's proposal to transfer Hopton parish ward from Mirfield borough ward to its proposed Kirkheaton & Hopton ward and that the general preference was that the whole parish remain in the same borough ward. We also noted that Holme Valley Parish Council's proposals could be accommodated in the Joint Submission proposals, while this would not be possible under the Conservative Group's proposals. In view of these considerations, and the fact that the reduction in council size was supported by the majority of members on the Council, we were satisfied that there was sufficient justification to reduce the existing council size by three members to 69.

45 During Stage Three, the Conservative Group accepted our draft recommendation for a council size of 69 and 23 wards, and no other comments were received regarding council size.

Electoral arrangements

46 As detailed previously, we proposed basing our draft recommendations on the Joint Submission made by the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council. We considered that this scheme would provide a better balance of the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. However, we decided to move away from the Joint Submission proposals in a number of areas in order to better reflect community identities and provide for stronger boundaries.

47 In response to our draft recommendations report, a large number of respondents supported our recommendation that Mirfield should be in one ward, opposed the transfer of the Castle Hill area of Almondbury ward to Newsome ward, and argued that Oakwell ward should retain its current name of Birstall & Birkenshaw.

48 At Stage Three the Joint Submission commented on the proposed wards of Batley East, Crosland Moor, Dewsbury East, Greenhead, Holme Valley North and Newsome. The Conservative Group submitted substantial proposals during Stage Three, based on a council size of 69, as opposed to its Stage One proposals based on a 72-member council.

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

- i. Birstall & Birkenshaw, Cleckheaton and Spen wards (page 27)
- ii. Batley East, Batley West and Heckmondwike wards (page 29)
- iii. Dewsbury East, Dewsbury West, Mirfield and Thornhill wards (page 32)
- iv. Almondbury, Dalton, Denby Dale and Kirkburton wards (page 34)
- v. Birkby, Deighton, Lindley and Paddock wards (page 37)
- vi. Colne Valley West, Crosland Moor, Golcar and Newsome wards (page 39)
- vii. Holme Valley North and Holme Valley South wards (page 41)

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

Birstall & Birkenshaw, Cleckheaton and Spen wards

51 These three wards are situated in the north of the borough. Birstall & Birkenshaw ward is bounded by Bradford to the north-west and Leeds to the north-east. Cleckheaton ward is bounded by Bradford to the north and the borough of Calderdale to the east, while Spen ward is also bounded by Calderdale to the east. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 11% above the borough average in Birstall & Birkenshaw ward, both in 2001 and by 2006, 5% below in Cleckheaton ward (2% below by 2006) and 1% above in Spen ward (equal to the average by 2006).

52 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed modifying the existing Birstall & Birkenshaw ward, and transferring part of Spen ward, to form their proposed Oakwell ward. They proposed transferring part of Birstall & Birkenshaw ward to their proposed Batley East and Batley West wards. The Joint Submission also proposed modifying the existing Cleckheaton ward to include parts of Spen ward. They proposed broadly retaining the remainder of Cleckheaton ward's existing boundaries, while transferring part of the existing Spen ward (the area broadly to the north of Quaker Lane) to their modified Cleckheaton ward. The Joint Submission proposed joining almost all of the remainder of the ward with part of the existing Heckmondwike ward (the area to the west of Huddersfield Road) to form their proposed Liversedge ward. The remaining area (the area to the east of Huddersfield Road and Leeds Road in the existing Spen ward) would be transferred to their modified Heckmondwike ward.

53 We noted the good levels of electoral equality achieved by the Joint Submission scheme in this area, and that it broadly sought to keep communities together. We also noted that it utilised strong boundaries, and though the proposed Cleckheaton and Oakwell wards would be dissected by the M62, we considered that the constraints of having three-member wards in metropolitan boroughs mean that such wards are sometimes unavoidable. However, we were content that there were sufficient crossing points to allow for convenient and effective local government, and we also noted that this reflected the situation under the current arrangements. We therefore proposed basing our recommendations in this area on the proposals in the Joint Submission, although we proposed a number of minor amendments to tie the boundaries to firm ground detail and to avoid the arbitrary division of some roads.

54 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 5% below the borough average in Cleckheaton ward (2% below by 2006), 2% above in Liversedge ward (equal to the average by 2006) and 4% below in Oakwell ward, both in 2001 and by 2006.

55 At Stage Three the Conservative Group put forward a number of amendments to the draft recommendations for all three wards. It proposed that Muffit Lane would provide 'a more logical boundary' between Liversedge and Oakwell wards, and Huddersfield Road a better boundary between Batley West ward and Oakwell ward. It stated that the area bounded by Dewsbury Road, Moor Lane and Bradford Road 'has always been a part of Gomersal' and should be retained as part of Liversedge ward, and a local resident also supported this proposal. The Conservative Group objected to the draft recommendation to transfer part of Birstall in Oakwell ward, north of Linear Walk, south-west of Howden Clough High School, south of Leeds Road and north of Batley Grammar School into Batley West ward, and proposed that the existing boundary along Linear Walk should be retained. It stated that this would avoid Birstall village being split by the boundary. The Conservative Group proposed that Oakwell ward should retain its current name of Birstall & Birkenshaw, as 'Oakwell, a small hall in the ward, bears no relevance to the communities of either Birstall or Birkenshaw'. It proposed that Liversedge ward should be named Spen Valley ward as it 'can see no justification' for the change to Liversedge

ward. Also regarding Liversedge ward, it proposed that the villages of Hunsworth and Drub (the area of Cleckheaton ward north of Merchant Fields Farm and the rugby football and cricket grounds, and south-east of the M62) be transferred back into its proposed Spen Valley ward (Liversedge ward) from Cleckheaton ward, as the villages have more affinity with Gomersal.

56 A local resident proposed that the Popely area of Liversedge ward, bounded by the A62, the rear of properties on the south side of Gomersal Road, and the rear of properties on the Stubley Estate, be transferred to Heckmondwike ward so that the whole of Heckmondwike would be within the ward of the same name. In addition he proposed that Liversedge ward be named Liversedge & Gomersal, as 'this ward contains most of the village of Gomersal as well as most of Liversedge' and would make the ward name more relevant to local people.

57 Batley & Spen Conservative Association strongly objected to the proposal to change Birstall & Birkenshaw ward to Oakwell, and argued that 'Birstall is a small historic town and Birkenshaw is a thriving village. Oakwell is not a village or a district'. Councillor Light and Councillor Palfreeman (both representing Birstall & Birkenshaw ward) objected to the proposal to change their ward name. Councillor Light noted that 'in the main the current ward will remain intact and that being the case, I see no reason to change the name' as the proposed name will not 'better reflect community identities'. Birstall Central Tenants and Residents Association strongly disagreed with the same proposal, and stated that it did not want to see any more change. Fieldhead Tenants & Residents Association found the same proposal 'totally (sic) unacceptable', as Birstall will 'lose (sic) its identity', and cause confusion. Birstall Village Improvement Group objected to the ward name Oakwell as it 'would be a disaster for us as we would lose our identity'. We also received 19 representations from local residents including two petitions with a total of 72 signatures, all of whom objected strongly to the draft recommendation to name Birstall & Birkenshaw ward Oakwell, and stated that the current ward name should be retained. The local residents stated that the ward would lose its identity and history if it were renamed Oakwell, which has no relevance to the area at all.

58 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have decided to endorse the draft recommendations for the boundaries of Birstall & Birkenshaw, Cleckheaton and Spen wards as they would achieve reasonable electoral equality and have received some local support. We do not propose to adopt the Conservative Group's proposals for the three wards, since its amendments would not improve upon the electoral variances, and we do not consider that it provided sufficient argumentation to amend our proposed wards. We do not propose to use Muffit Lane or Huddersfield Road as a boundary for the south of Oakwell ward, as there appears to be little local support for these proposals. We note the Conservative Group's and local resident's proposal to include the Moor Lane area of Oakwell ward in Liversedge ward. However, as we noted in our draft recommendations, Cleckheaton and Oakwell wards are dissected by the M62, and the constraints of three-member wards in metropolitan boroughs mean that breaching such boundaries is sometimes unavoidable, and we were content that there are sufficient crossing points. We note the Conservative Group's proposal to transfer the area of Batley West ward, north of Linear Walk, into Oakwell ward. However, as there appears to be little other local opposition to this proposal, we do not propose to adopt such a major amendment affecting approximately 2,300 electors at this stage. We also note its proposal to transfer the villages of Hunsworth and Drub from Cleckheaton ward into Liversedge ward. However, there appears to be little local support for this proposal, and noting that some 1,200 electors would be affected if this amendment were adopted, we are unwilling to amend our draft recommendations at this stage. We also consider that the villages have clear road links with Cleckheaton. We note the local resident's proposal to include the remainder of Heckmondwike, currently in Liversedge (to the north of Leeds Road and east of Gomersal Road), within Heckmondwike ward. However, we have utilised Leeds Road as a clear boundary from the south of Liversedge ward, and do not propose to depart from it, as we consider it a clear and identifiable boundary.

59 However, we have decided to move away from our draft recommendations and modify the proposed ward names of Oakwell (currently named Birstall & Birkenshaw ward) and Liversedge (currently named Spennings ward) to Birstall & Birkenshaw and Liversedge & Gomersal wards, in light of representations received from the Conservative Group (regarding Oakwell), councillors, local organisations and local residents. We are persuaded that the names Birstall & Birkenshaw and Liversedge & Gomersal would more accurately reflect the communities than Oakwell and Liversedge wards. We do not propose to adopt the Conservative Group's proposal to name the ward name Spennings Valley ward in place of Liversedge ward, as we consider that the name Liversedge & Gomersal would better reflect the ward.

60 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Birstall & Birkenshaw and Cleckheaton wards would be 4% and 5% below the borough average respectively, and Liversedge & Gomersal ward would be 2% above the borough average (4% below, 2% below and equal to the average in 2006).

Batley East, Batley West and Heckmondwike wards

61 These three wards are situated in the north of the borough. Batley East ward is bounded by Leeds to the north-east and Wakefield to the south-east. Heckmondwike ward is bounded by Calderdale to the west. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 5% above the borough average in Batley East ward (7% above by 2006), 10% above in Batley West ward (11% above by 2006) and 11% above in Heckmondwike ward (12% above by 2006).

62 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that the remainder of the existing Heckmondwike ward be joined with part of the existing Spennings ward and part of the existing Batley West ward. They then proposed modifying the existing Batley West ward to transfer the area to their modified Heckmondwike ward. They also proposed transferring the area to the east of Clerk Green Street, Mayman Lane and Stocks Lane, and the area to the north of Bradford Road and east of Carlinghow Hill to their modified Batley East ward. They also proposed transferring one area to the west of North Lodge Fold, Brewerton Lane and Staincliffe Road to their proposed Dewsbury West ward. They proposed transferring part of the existing Birstall & Birkenshaw ward to their modified Batley West ward. The area broadly to the south of Upper Road, Town Street and Jack Lane, and the area to the south of Grasmere Road and Langdale Road in the settlement of Hanging Heaton would be transferred to their proposed Dewsbury East ward.

63 We noted that the proposals made in the Joint Submission used strong boundaries such as Huddersfield Road/Leeds Road and also managed to achieve good levels of electoral equality. However, we noted that the proposals for Batley East ward would have resulted in the Hanging Heaton settlement being divided between the proposed Batley East and Dewsbury East wards. In the Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups argued that 'this...divides the settlement of Hanging Heaton between the two towns; a situation which is supported and disputed by local residents in equal measure'. They did not, however, add any justification as to why they proposed splitting the settlement as opposed to keeping it together. Having visited the area, we considered the properties on either side of their proposed boundary to be similar, and we were not persuaded that adopting this proposal would provide a good reflection of the statutory criteria. We therefore proposed amending the proposed Batley East ward to unite the Hanging Heaton area and made amendments elsewhere in the proposed Dewsbury East ward in order to facilitate this. Notwithstanding this amendment, we considered that the proposals for the other two wards in this area would provide good levels of electoral equality, reflect communities and utilise strong boundaries. We therefore proposed adopting them with two minor amendments to tie the boundaries to firm ground detail and to ensure better access for electors within the wards. We proposed that the whole of the Hanging Heaton settlement be transferred to our proposed Dewsbury East ward. We also proposed an amendment to the proposed boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East (which follows

the existing boundary) in the very east of the ward, in order to tie it to firm ground detail. In order to facilitate the transfer of Hanging Heaton, we propose transferring part of the proposed Dewsbury East ward to our proposed Batley East ward, in order to improve upon electoral equality. We also proposed two minor amendments to the boundary between the proposed Heckmondwike and Batley West wards around White Lee Road, and the boundary between Batley West and Batley East ward, to include the properties to the south of Chinewood Avenue within Batley West ward.

64 Under the draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 3% below the borough average in Batley East ward, both in 2001 and by 2006, 1% above in Batley West ward (3% above by 2006) and 4% below in Heckmondwike ward (2% below by 2006).

65 In response to the draft recommendations the Joint Submission proposed a number of amendments to the boundary of Batley East ward. It proposed a revision of the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East wards, so that the southern boundary of Batley East ward would no longer follow Hartley Street, but the footpath to the west of Mill Road and north of the recreation ground, to the existing boundary at Halifax Road. It argued that this would provide 'a more logical and natural boundary on the ground'. The Joint Submission and Batley East Liberal Democrats put forward an amendment to retain the existing boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East ward, as the Joint Submission did not see a 'reason why this boundary should intrude so far into Batley East'. Therefore it proposed that the boundary pass south of Lees House Farm and cross Leeds Road, before running south to Grange Road and the playing field. It further proposed an amendment to the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East, so that the boundary in Hanging Heaton would follow Kirkgate, instead of the backs of houses. It stated that the draft boundary 'ignores the deeply held loyalties of residents of the area', the 'original, northern part of Hanging Heaton' north of Kirkgate, to Batley, and the remainder of Hanging Heaton electorate are divided in their loyalties between Dewsbury and Batley. The Joint Submission, supported by Batley East Liberal Democrats, put forward a further revision to the Batley East and Dewsbury East boundary in Crackenedge, which will be detailed later. It also proposed that the boundary between Batley West ward and Heckmondwike ward be amended to incorporate Field Head Farm in Heckmondwike ward, since the farm entrance is in the latter ward.

66 The Conservative Group supported the draft recommendations for Heckmondwike ward but submitted amendments to Batley East and Batley West wards. It proposed two amendments to the boundary between Batley West and Oakwell wards, detailed earlier. The Conservative Group also proposed to transfer part of Batley East ward, to the west of Hyrstlands Road and Purlwell Lane and south of Gladwin Street, into Batley West ward. It stated that these were 'minor changes....to improve electoral equality'. It also proposed to transfer the area of Batley East ward to the south of Hyrstlands Park and Howard Street, east of the railway, south of Mill Lane, and west of our proposed boundary to the west of Hanging Heaton into Dewsbury East ward. It stated that these areas (Crackenedge and Commonsides) 'have more affinity with Dewsbury than the Hanging Heaton area'. The Conservative Group further proposed that 'given there is no clear local majority view for change' as regards Hanging Heaton, it 'proposed an amended boundary accordingly using the main Leeds Road as the dividing line between Dewsbury East and Batley East wards'.

67 Batley East Liberal Democrats expressed concern regarding the draft recommendations for Hanging Heaton, and so proposed that the north-east part of Hanging Heaton be transferred to Batley East ward, so the remainder would be within Dewsbury East. They proposed to retain Upper Road as the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East wards, to keep the Lidgate Gardens area within Dewsbury. Their other three amendments were the same as those proposed by the Joint Submission, as described above.

68 Councillor Pandor proposed that two small areas of Batley East and Batley West wards be transferred between the two wards. He proposed that the current boundary along Dark Lane be

retained, and that Wellington Street should provide the northern boundary to link it with Clerk Green Street. He stated that this area identifies with the Clerk Green & Woodsome estate. He also proposed to transfer the area of Batley West ward, to the north of Bradford Road, south of Chinewood Avenue and south-east of Carlinghow Hill, into Batley East ward, to avoid splitting the community and isolating electors. He contended that his proposals would help the communities to maintain their 'sustainability, identify (sic) and cohesiveness' and would also 'provide better clarification of the boundaries'.

69 A local resident proposed that the whole of Heckmondwike be included within Heckmondwike ward, as detailed earlier.

70 Another local resident stated that Roberttown Residents Committee currently has a good working relationship with Heckmondwike councillors, which would be lost if Roberttown were incorporated into Liversedge ward. He also stated that Roberttown will 'be in an unknown ward of small villages, out of touch with the main towns of Heckmondwike' and Cleckheaton.

71 We have given careful consideration to the evidence and representations received, and we have decided to broadly confirm our draft recommendations as final. However, we do propose adopting five minor amendments to better reflect community identities. We do not intend adopting the Joint Submission's proposal to transfer the northern part of Hanging Heaton from Dewsbury East ward into Batley East ward, or Batley East Liberal Democrats' proposal to transfer a broadly similar area into Batley East ward. We are not persuaded by the arguments provided to move away from our draft recommendation to unite Hanging Heaton, and consider that the High Street area should remain in a ward with the neighbouring area. We do not propose to adopt the Conservative Group's proposals in the Batley area, because we consider, as stated in our draft recommendations, that Hanging Heaton should be in Dewsbury East ward, and the Conservative Group's proposals in this area are dependent on the transfer of Hanging Heaton to Batley East ward. We consider that the Conservatives' proposals are also too extensive and affect too many electors to be adopted at this stage. We further note that the Conservative Group proposed to keep Hanging Heaton in one ward and not divide it, and that it asserts that opinion is split as to which ward the area should be incorporated in. We therefore propose to endorse our draft recommendations for Hanging Heaton.

72 We do not propose to adopt Batley East Liberal Democrats' proposal to retain Upper Road as the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East wards. This amendment was adopted in order to facilitate the transfer of Hanging Heaton and to improve upon electoral equality. Since we propose to confirm our draft recommendations in this area, we do not propose to reinstate the whole of the electorate north of Hartley Street and south of Upper Road into Dewsbury East ward. We also consider that the area immediately south of Upper Road has clear road links with Batley East ward. However, we do propose to move away from our draft recommendations slightly, to adopt the Joint Submission's proposal to place the boundary along the footpath north of Hartley Street and north of the recreation ground, as this would only affect 40 electors. We note Councillor Pandor's proposals to transfer two areas between Batley East and Batley West wards. We do not propose to endorse his proposal to adopt Dark Lane as the boundary between Batley East and Batley West wards, as we consider that Clerk Green Street, Mayman Lane and Track Road provide a clear boundary, which should not be broken. However, we do propose to adopt his proposal to transfer the area of Batley West ward, north of Bradford Road and east of Carlinghow Hill, into Batley East ward. We note that the Joint Submission also proposed this at Stage One. We consider that the area in question could become isolated if it remained as part of Batley West ward, as it is surrounded by industrial buildings to the south, and is linked by a footpath and Carlinghow Hill to the Chinewood area. We note the local resident's concern regarding Roberttown. However, as noted earlier, we do not propose to breach the strong boundary of Leeds Road, as stated in the draft recommendations. We also consider that Roberttown contains too large an electorate to provide acceptable levels of electoral equality were it transferred to Heckmondwike ward.

73 We have also decided to move away from our draft recommendations in light of the Joint Submission and Batley East Liberal Democrats' proposal to retain the existing boundary across Leeds Road and south to the school on the corner of Challenge Way and Leeds Road, rather than run the boundary along Sykes Lane and Mill Forest Way. We are persuaded that the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East should be modified so that it follows the existing boundary across Leeds Road, and not run along Sykes Lane to the west. However, we propose that the boundary follow the backs of the houses to the west of Leeds Road as far as the existing boundary at Grange Road. We consider this to be a clearer boundary than the existing boundary, which would not alter the number of electors affected (approximately 100). We propose to adopt the Joint Submission's proposal to transfer Field Head Farm from Batley West ward to Heckmondwike ward, and note its argument that the farm's entrance is within Heckmondwike ward. In order to tie the boundary to ground detail, we propose to run it along the field edge to the east of the farm. We further propose to adopt the Joint Submission and Batley East Liberal Democrat's proposal to transfer the Crackenedge area into Dewsbury East ward, to be detailed later.

74 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor for Batley East, Batley West and Heckmondwike wards would be 4% below, equal to, and 4% below the borough average respectively (3% below, 2% above and 2% below by 2006).

Dewsbury East, Dewsbury West, Mirfield and Thornhill wards

75 These four wards are situated in the east of the borough. Dewsbury East and Thornhill wards are bounded by Wakefield to the east. Dewsbury West ward contains Northorpe parish ward of Mirfield parish. Mirfield ward contains the remainder of Mirfield parish, which comprises Battyeford, Crossley, Easthorpe and Hopton parish wards. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 7% below the borough average in Dewsbury East ward (8% below by 2006), 5% above in Dewsbury West ward (6% above by 2006), 2% above in Mirfield ward (1% above by 2006) and 1% above in Thornhill ward (4% above by 2006).

76 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that Mirfield parish should be coterminous with Mirfield borough ward. They argued that this ward, forecast to be under-represented by 13% by 2006, 'would not have been considered as a complete ward without very strong local support'. In order to compensate for the loss of electors in Northorpe parish ward, they proposed transferring part of the existing Batley West ward and part of the existing Dewsbury East ward to their modified Dewsbury West ward. They proposed retaining the existing Thornhill ward but renaming it Dewsbury South ward. Mirfield Town Council proposed that the size of the council be reduced from 72 to 69 in order to facilitate the inclusion of Northorpe parish ward of Mirfield parish in Mirfield borough ward. However, if this reduction was not adopted, it requested 'that this area could be given special consideration' and that the area be transferred anyway, as it contended that Northorpe parish ward shares no affinity with the remainder of the existing Dewsbury West ward and that the situation created some confusion among residents. Mirfield Civic Society objected to the existing arrangements for Mirfield parish, and also proposed that Northorpe parish ward be transferred to Mirfield borough ward. Councillor Bowden and Councillor Mrs Bowden (town councillor for Mirfield) and 18 local residents also proposed this transfer, while another three local residents proposed a Mirfield North ward and a Mirfield South ward. One of these residents proposed that Kirkheaton parish ward of Kirkburton parish (currently in Dalton ward) be transferred to her proposed Mirfield South ward, with the remainder of the existing Dalton ward being transferred to the existing Almondbury ward. Councillor Andrews (town councillor for Mirfield) also objected to the current arrangements for Mirfield parish and proposed that the council size be reduced by 12 to 60 to allow the parish to be contained within one borough ward that did not contain high levels of electoral inequality. As an alternative, he proposed two Mirfield wards, Mirfield North and Mirfield South, also incorporating polling districts from the existing Dalton, Heckmondwike, Kirkburton and Thornhill wards. Mayor Hutchinson

(Mirfield) forwarded 39 pro-forma letters from residents objecting to the current arrangements for Northorpe parish ward, proposing that it be transferred to Mirfield borough ward. Another local resident proposed that the council size be reduced from 72 to 63 to allow the whole of Mirfield parish to be contained in one borough ward, with electors from the Batley wards being transferred to Dewsbury West ward in order to increase the number of electors. One local resident proposed that only polling district DW9 (part of Northorpe parish ward) be transferred to Mirfield borough ward. Four local residents proposed that Hopton parish ward remain in Mirfield borough ward, with one of these residents also proposing that as much of Mirfield parish as possible should be included in the same ward.

77 We noted the considerable community support to reunite Mirfield parish in one borough ward, despite the resulting under-representation which was forecast by 2006. We considered the Conservative Group's proposals for Mirfield parish as a possible alternative in order to achieve better electoral equality. However, under our proposed council size of 69, transferring the whole of this area to the proposed Dalton ward as proposed in the Joint Submission would result in the ward being under-represented by 13% by 2006. Therefore a smaller part of Hopton had to be transferred from the Mirfield ward proposed in the Joint Submission. However, we did not consider this to be a good reflection of community identity as there would have to be an arbitrary boundary drawn within the existing settlement in order to achieve good levels of electoral equality. We also noted that, while a small number of respondents proposed two Mirfield wards, the majority of submissions requested that the whole parish remain in the same ward. We therefore proposed adopting the Joint Submission's proposed Mirfield ward. Although we would not normally recommend such a high variance in the more urban centre of a borough, we acknowledged the significant local support for this proposal and the preference that the parish and borough ward boundaries be coterminous. We proposed adopting the Dewsbury South and Dewsbury West wards as proposed in the Joint Submission. We considered that these utilised, in the main, strong boundaries, achieved good levels of electoral equality and acknowledged the local support for the proposals for Mirfield ward.

78 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2% below the borough average in Dewsbury East ward (3% below by 2006), 4% below in Dewsbury South ward (equal to the average by 2006), 7% below in Dewsbury West ward (4% below by 2006) and 16% above in Mirfield ward (13% above by 2006).

79 In response to the draft recommendations, the Joint Submission proposed amendments to the Hanging Heaton, Hartley Street and Leeds Road boundaries between Batley East and Dewsbury East, as detailed earlier (the latter supported by Batley East Liberal Democrats). The Joint Submission also proposed a revision to the same boundary so that it would run northwards along the railway line, cross eastwards at the point where Crackenedge Lane changes to Commonside, and then run southwards along the backs of the houses to Ward Street. We note that Batley East Liberal Democrats also supported this proposal, which would transfer just 83 electors from Batley East to Dewsbury East ward. We also note that the Conservative Group submitted proposals affecting the areas of Commonside, Crackenedge and Hanging Heaton, as detailed earlier. We further note that the Conservative Group supported our draft recommendations for Dewsbury West and Mirfield wards.

80 Mirfield town Councillor Taylor supported our draft recommendation to re-unite Mirfield in one ward, as he is aware of the Northorpe electors' 'feelings of isolation and nor (sic) belonging to Mirfield'. Councillor Taylor (representing Mirfield ward) commended the draft recommendation 'to reunite Mirfield as one complete ward instead of residents being split between 4 Wards (sic) as they are at present'. Mirfield Civic Society 'fully support' our recommendation to transfer Northorpe parish from Dewsbury West ward to Mirfield ward. Our draft recommendation for Mirfield was supported by 141 local residents, who opposed the Conservative Group's Stage One proposals. They opposed the Conservative Group's proposals to transfer Hopton and Battyeford from Mirfield ward to Kirkheaton ward, and argued that these two areas have no affinity or connections with Kirkheaton. Many of the local residents expressed concerns that, as

a result of the potential changes to the Mirfield ward boundary, their access to local services such as doctors and schools would be curtailed, and their addresses, postcodes and telephone numbers would be altered. One local resident supported the Conservative Group's Stage One proposal to link Lower Hopton with Kirkheaton, and stated that they would prefer to be part of Kirkheaton than Mirfield, as the former has better services.

81 The representations received during the consultation period have been carefully considered, and we have decided to broadly confirm the draft recommendations as final. We note the support of Councillors Taylor and Taylor, Mirfield Civic Society and 141 local residents, for our draft recommendation to unite Mirfield in one ward, and in the light of these representations we propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Mirfield. We also note the local resident's concerns regarding access to local services following ward boundary changes. However, these concerns are based on incorrect assumptions regarding the implications of any ward boundary changes in the area. The Committee would like to assure residents that extraneous factors such as postcodes, telephone numbers, insurance premiums, house prices, council tax, medical services and school catchment areas are not affected by ward boundary changes, nor are they taken into account by the Committee when formulating its recommendations.

82 We have decided to move away from our draft recommendations and modify the proposed boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East wards. We note the support of the Joint Submission and Batley East Liberal Democrats for this amendment, which would affect just 83 electors, and result in the whole of Crackenedge Lane being included in Dewsbury East ward. As detailed earlier, we do not propose to adopt the Joint Submission and Conservative Group's proposals regarding Hanging Heaton and Commonsides. We propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Dewsbury South and Mirfield, in light of the Conservative Group's and local resident's support for our Mirfield proposals, and considering we received no other representations regarding the former.

83 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor for Dewsbury East, Dewsbury South and Dewsbury West wards would be 1%, 4% and 7% respectively below the borough average, and Mirfield ward would be 16% over the borough average (2% below, equal to, 4% below, and 13% above the average by 2006).

Almondbury, Dalton, Denby Dale and Kirkburton wards

84 These four wards are situated in the centre and east of the borough. Denby Dale and Kirkburton are each bounded by Wakefield to the east, while Denby Dale ward is also bounded by Barnsley to the south. Dalton ward contains Kirkheaton parish ward of Kirkburton parish. Kirkburton ward comprises Flockton, Kirkburton, Lepton, Shepley, Thurstonland & Farnley Tyas and Whitley Upper parish wards of Kirkburton. Denby Dale ward contains the remainder of Kirkburton parish, Shelley parish ward, while also containing Denby Dale parish. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 18% below the borough average in Almondbury ward (22% below by 2006), 4% below in Dalton ward (5% below by 2006), 18% above in Denby Dale ward (15% above by 2006) and 14% above in Kirkburton ward (13% above by 2006).

85 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that the existing Almondbury ward be modified to transfer the western part of the ward to their proposed Newsome ward, along with the south-western part of the ward. They then proposed transferring part of the existing Kirkburton ward (most of the existing Lepton parish ward of Kirkburton parish) to their modified Almondbury ward. They also proposed modifying the existing Dalton ward, extending it westwards as far as the railway line and incorporating the area to the west of the industrial estates off Leeds Road from the existing Deighton ward. This ward would continue to contain most of the existing Kirkheaton parish ward of Kirkburton parish, and would gain Shelley parish ward of Kirkburton parish, currently in Denby Dale ward. The revised Denby Dale ward would be coterminous with Denby Dale parish. The

Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council stated: 'Kirkburton parish is too populous to be considered as a single ward so we have been compelled to put parts of the parish into Dalton and Almondbury...the ward is a compromise forced on us by our desire to respect local support for parish boundaries in the Holme Valley, Denby Dale and Mirfield.' Denby Dale Parish Council proposed that the existing warding arrangements for Denby Dale parish be retained. Kirkburton Parish Council objected to the current electoral arrangements whereby Kirkburton parish is divided between three borough wards. It proposed that the parish be divided between two borough wards to reduce the confusion for electors. It proposed a Kirkburton North ward comprising the existing Kirkheaton, Lepton, Whitley Upper and Flockton parish wards, and a Kirkburton South ward comprising the remainder of Kirkburton parish. This proposal was supported by Kirkburton & District Civic Society, although they acknowledged the consequential effect that these proposals would have on other parished areas within Kirklees. Shelley Community Association proposed that Shelley parish ward of Kirkburton parish be part of the same borough ward as the remainder of Kirkburton parish, and this was also proposed by three local residents. One local resident proposed that Kirkheaton parish ward of Kirkburton parish, currently in Dalton ward, be transferred to her proposed Mirfield South ward, with the remainder of the existing Dalton ward being transferred to the existing Almondbury ward. Councillor May, while broadly supporting the proposals made by the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council, proposed that part of the A62 Leeds Road corridor from Huddersfield to Whitacre Street remain in Deighton ward for topographical, community and local identity reasons.

86 We noted the request by Kirkburton Parish Council and Kirkburton & District Civic Society that Kirkburton parish be divided between two borough wards, rather than between three, as under the existing arrangements and as proposed by the Joint Submission. However, such a proposal would significantly impact upon the surrounding wards, a point acknowledged by the Parish Council and the Civic Society. Kirkburton & District Civic Society attempted to make proposals to address this but also acknowledged that 'these arrangements would not make for a happy solution' and would, in particular, jeopardise a united Mirfield parish which, it stated, it would support in preference. Therefore, while we did not consider it ideal for Kirkburton parish to be divided between three borough wards, we were unable to identify a viable alternative which would not significantly affect the remainder of the surrounding area. We also noted that these proposals would be supported by Denby Dale Parish Council, Shelley Community Association and the three local residents who wrote in regarding this issue. We therefore adopted all four of the Joint Submission's wards in this area, with a minor amendment between the proposed Almondbury and Kirkburton wards to tie the boundary to firm ground detail. We noted the proposed amendment by Councillor May in the Dalton area. However, we considered that to transfer the area to the west of Leeds Road to either the proposed Ashbrow or Greenhead wards would have a significant impact on the other wards in this area, and we therefore did not propose to adopt this amendment.

87 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the borough average in Almondbury ward (3% below by 2006), 1% below in Dalton ward (3% below by 2006), 5% below in Denby Dale ward (6% below by 2006) and 3% below in Kirkburton ward (2% below by 2006).

88 At Stage Three the Conservative Group put forward substantial amendments to the draft recommendations for Kirkburton, as it stated that our proposals had recognised the problems caused by splitting Kirkburton parish over three wards, but 'failed to deal with them effectively'. It acknowledged that its Stage One proposals for a Kirkburton/Hopton ward 'were not ideal' and therefore put forward revised proposals for the Kirkburton and Huddersfield area, as it 'cannot support the loss of Lepton into inner Huddersfield' or the continued division of Kirkburton parish. The Conservative Group therefore put forward two new Kirkburton wards, Kirkburton North and Kirkburton South. Its Kirkburton North ward would be based on part of Almondbury ward east of Greenside Infant and Nursery School and north of Southfield Road plus Lepton parish ward less the area south of Highgate Lane and Station Road. The ward would also be based on part of Dalton ward (east of Dalton Bank Road and Nettleton Road, south of Briggate and Long Lane

and east of Dalton playing fields and Dalton Green Lane from the junction with Cross Green Road) plus Kirkheaton parish ward, and Flockton, Lepton and Lepton & Whitley Upper parish wards of Kirkburton ward, less part of Lepton & Whitley Upper parish ward south of Wakefield Road. The Group stated that it 'accepts that the split of Lepton is not ideal, but it remains a better alternative than the split proposed for this village in the draft recommendations, and it remains wholly within the Kirkburton parish'. Its proposed Kirkburton South ward would be based on the remainder of Kirkburton ward and the southern part of Lepton parish ward. As a consequence of these proposals, the Conservative Group also proposed four new Huddersfield wards, as detailed later.

89 Kirkburton Parish Council regretted that 'the Boundary Committee has completely ignored its submission' for new ward boundaries coincident with two wards rather than three. It stated that the draft recommendations would divide Lepton village between two wards, and requested that its original proposal for two Kirkburton wards be reconsidered. Kirkburton & District Civic Society also expressed disappointment that Kirkburton parish would continue to be divided between three wards under the draft recommendations. It supported the transfer of Shelley to Kirkburton ward but objected to the transfer of part of Lepton to Almondbury ward, as it contended that this would result in a parish being split, and an ill-defined boundary, and would also not reflect community identity. It also maintained that the draft recommendations would not provide 'effective and convenient local government', as Kirkburton would be divided between different wards, parliamentary constituencies and area planning committees. The Society reasserted its Stage One proposal that the parish should be split over two wards, and noted that it would be 'more satisfactory to adjust the numbers of the representatives rather than the numbers of the represented'. Two local residents expressed concern at the draft recommendation to transfer part of Lepton from Kirkburton ward to Almondbury ward, and stated that the recommendations just equalise electoral numbers, and fail to 'take account of the community link which Lepton has enjoyed with Kirkburton for centuries'. They asserted that Lepton has no affinity with Almondbury, and should not be divided between two wards, which would also cut across the ancient Deanery of Kirkburton.

90 Councillor Denham (representing Almondbury ward) strongly objected to the draft recommendation to transfer the Castle Hill area in the south-west of Almondbury ward (west of Bottoms Farm and Wheatroyd Lane) into Newsome ward, and noted the historical and cultural links between Almondbury and the Castle Hill area. She also submitted a 181-signature petition in support of the Castle Hill area remaining in the Almondbury ward. Almondbury (Lumb) Civic Associates also expressed concern that the Castle Hill area could be part of Newsome ward and stated that, as so few electors would be affected, the area should remain in Almondbury ward. Almondbury (Castle Hill) Civic Associates expressed 'dismay' at the draft recommendation to move 'the Castle Hill, Lumb Lane and Ashes Lane areas from Almondbury ward into Newsome ward', as the area has no connections with Newsome. Eleven local residents also conveyed similar concerns regarding Castle Hill's historical links with Almondbury and lack of affinity with Newsome ward, arguing that the area should remain within Almondbury ward.

91 We have carefully considered all the representations received, and propose to broadly confirm our draft recommendations. We note the Conservative Group's proposals for two new Kirkburton wards based on various parts of the proposed wards described above, and their concerns regarding the draft recommendation to split Kirkburton parish over three wards. However, we do not propose to adopt its proposals. We note that the number of electors per councillor in Kirkburton North ward would be 9% above the borough average (by 2006). We consider that there is insufficient argumentation to justify such a level of electoral equality. We further note that a significant amount of electors would be affected by the Conservatives' proposals for Kirkburton, which would have a knock-on effect in the four Huddersfield wards. We further note that this knock-on-effect would result in electoral variances of 15% and 20% above, and 20% below, the borough average for Huddersfield Central, Huddersfield East and Huddersfield North wards respectively, in the Huddersfield town area. We therefore consider that the Conservative Groups' proposals for Kirkburton would not better reflect our statutory criteria

than our draft recommendations, and do not propose adopting them. We also note the Conservative Group's proposal to split the village of Lepton between its proposed Kirkburton North and Kirkburton South wards, which we consider to be no improvement on the draft recommendations for Lepton. We further note the Conservative Group, Kirkburton & District Civic Society, Kirkburton Parish Council and local residents concern regarding the proposed division of Kirkburton parish and Lepton village over a number of wards. However, as we noted in our draft recommendations report, 'while we do not consider it ideal for Kirkburton parish to be divided between three borough wards, we have been unable to identify a viable alternative which would not impact significantly upon the remainder of the surrounding area, given the size (both geographically and in terms of electorate) of the parish'. We note Kirkburton & District Civic Society's comment that it would be better to adjust the number of councillors rather than the number of electors; however, we are constrained by the requirement to have wards devisable by three councillors. Therefore we do not propose to adopt the Conservative Group, Kirkburton & District Civic Society, Kirkburton Parish Council or the local resident's proposals regarding the Kirkburton area.

92 We propose to move away from our draft recommendations in light of objections regarding the proposal to transfer the Castle Hill area from Almondbury ward to Newsome ward. We note Councillor Denham, local organisations and local residents comments regarding the historical and community links the area in question has with Almondbury, and that only 160 electors (148 by 2006) would be affected if the area were to be retained within Almondbury ward. Therefore we propose to retain the Castle Hill area in Almondbury ward.

93 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor for Almondbury, Dalton, Denby Dale and Kirkburton wards would be 2% above, 1%, 5% and 3% below the borough average respectively (2%, 3%, 6% and 2% below by 2006).

Birkby, Deighton, Lindley and Paddock wards

94 These four wards are situated in the west of the borough. Birkby, Deighton and Lindley wards are bounded by Calderdale to the west. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 3% below the borough average in Birkby ward (5% below by 2006), 30% below in Deighton ward (27% below by 2006), 6% above in Lindley ward, both in 2001 and by 2006, and 8% below in Paddock ward (11% below by 2006).

95 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that approximately half of the existing Birkby ward be joined with the majority of the existing Deighton ward to form their proposed Ashbrow ward. The majority of the remainder of the existing Deighton ward would be transferred to their revised Dalton ward. The majority of the remainder of the existing Birkby ward would form part of their proposed Greenhead ward, along with part of the existing Deighton ward, most of the existing Paddock ward and a small part of the existing Lindley ward. The area to the south of the A629 and the A62 in the existing Deighton ward would be transferred to their proposed Newsome ward. Their revised Lindley ward would comprise the majority of the existing Lindley ward, other than the area mentioned above and the area to the south of New Hey Road, as far east as Dunsmore Drive. It would also include part of the existing Birkby ward, part of the existing Paddock ward and a small part of the existing Golcar ward. The remainder of the existing Lindley ward would be transferred to their proposed Golcar ward, while the remainder of the existing Paddock ward would be transferred to their proposed Crosland Moor, Golcar and Newsome wards. Longwood Village Group proposed amendments to the existing Lindley and Paddock wards in order to unite the village of Longwood in one ward, stating that 'Longwood has a long history and a clear sense of identity'. It proposed transferring part of Golcar ward to its revised Paddock ward. It then proposed transferring polling district LI7 and the area to the south of New Hey Road from the existing Lindley ward to its revised Golcar ward, which would be named Golcar & Longwood ward. Councillor May proposed an amendment to the proposals for Deighton ward.

96 We noted the alternative suggestion by Longwood Village Group for their proposed Golcar & Longwood ward and consequential amendments to neighbouring wards. However, we noted that this proposal would result in Golcar & Lindley ward being a detached ward. Furthermore, under our proposed council size of 69, the group's proposed Colne West ward would be over-represented by 14% by 2006. We noted that the proposals of the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups build on the existing communities in this area, and also that their proposed Greenhead ward would encompass the compact urban area of Huddersfield town centre. Furthermore, they achieved good levels of electoral equality. We therefore based our draft recommendations on the proposals made in the Joint Submission, subject to three minor amendments to tie the boundaries to firm ground detail and to ensure logical boundaries.

97 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1% above the borough average in Ashbrow ward (3% above by 2006), 5% above in Greenhead ward (1% above by 2006) and 4% above in Lindley ward, both in 2001 by 2006.

98 At Stage Three the Joint Submission put forward a proposal to amend the boundary between Greenhead and Newsome wards 'in light of comments by local residents' so the residents of Highfields would not be split between two wards, and the boundary would be tied to 'easily-recognised physical features'. It proposed that the boundary should run anti-clockwise along the Huddersfield ring road from the junction with St John's Road, and then follow Greenhead Road until the road meets the draft boundary at Park Avenue. As a result of its proposals for the Kirkburton area, the Conservative Group put forward a new Huddersfield Central ward based on part of Newsome ward (west of Oaken Bank Plantation and Martin Bank Wood, north of Ashenhurst Avenue, Stile Common and the cricket ground) and part of Greenhead ward (south of Sunnybank Road, Forest Avenue, Syringa Street, Edgerton Grove Road and Blacker Road, Kings Cliff Road, Wasp Nest Road and Cobcroft Road, and west of Bradford Road). It proposed a new Huddersfield East ward based on part of Ashbrow ward (east of Bradford Road and south of Lower Fell Greave, Bradley Gate Wood and south-east of Leeds Road), part of Dalton ward (approximately west of Dalton Bank Road, Nettleton Road, north of Briggate and Long Lane and west of Dalton playing fields and Dalton Green Lane from junction with Cross Green Road) and part of Greenhead ward (east of Bradford Road). It also proposed Huddersfield North ward based on the remainder of Ashbrow ward described above, and part of Greenhead ward (north of the area described above).

99 Highfields Community Residents' Association expressed concern regarding our draft recommendations for the current Paddock ward, and stated that its members would be 'dramatically divided into two completely separate wards. For many years our community has always prided itself with a close association with the Greenhead Park area and the Paddock ward'. It therefore put forward two options for the boundary between Greenhead and Newsome wards, the first of which would run the boundary along Castlegate from the junction with St John's Road, and then run along Fitzwilliam Street to the draft boundary at Trinity Street. The Association's alternative boundary would run along Castlegate and then Greenhead Road. Paddock Community Forum put forward an amendment so that the boundary between Greenhead and Crosland Moor wards would run along the Huddersfield Narrow Canal as far as the aqueduct across the river Colne, where the boundary would follow the river and the existing boundary. It also proposed to transfer the Royds Hall estate from Golcar and Lindley wards to Greenhead ward. It stated that 'the main thrust' of its submission was to keep 'together present social groupings' so that the 'natural and historic community' of Paddock is not split between wards. The forum also stated that it did not wish to 'work with two different Local Area Committees' on a planned cycle route and canal development.

100 We have carefully considered all the representations received, and have decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these three wards. We note the Joint Submission and Highfields Community Residents' Association's concerns regarding the draft recommendations for the boundary between Greenhead and Newsome wards. We consider that not enough

evidence was provided by either group as to why the boundary should be altered. We also note that the Joint Submission's proposal to transfer 563 electors from Newsome to Greenhead ward would worsen the electoral variances so that Greenhead ward would be 9% above the borough average (5% by 2006), and Newsome ward would be 3% below the borough average (6% below by 2006). Therefore we have not been persuaded to change the boundary, and propose to confirm our draft recommendation. We note Paddock Community Forum's proposals for the Paddock area, and the boundaries between Crosland Moor, Golcar, Greenhead and Newsome wards. However, we consider that it did not put forward a strong enough argument to persuade us to adopt its proposals. Therefore we propose to confirm our draft recommendations as final.

101 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 1% above the borough average in Ashbrow ward (3% above by 2006), 5% above in Greenhead ward (1% above by 2006) and 4% above in Lindley ward, both in 2001 and by 2006.

Colne Valley West, Crosland Moor, Golcar and Newsome wards

102 These four wards are in the west and centre of the borough. Colne Valley West ward is bounded by Calderdale to the north-west and Oldham to the south-west. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 13% below the borough average in Colne Valley West ward, both in 2001 and by 2006, 3% below in Crosland Moor ward (2% below by 2006), 5% above in Golcar ward (6% above by 2006) and 11% below in Newsome ward (17% below by 2006).

103 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed a new Colne Valley ward comprising almost all of the existing Colne Valley West ward, the south-westernmost part of the existing Lindley ward and the western part of the existing Golcar ward. Their revised Crosland Moor ward would comprise most of the existing Crosland Moor ward, other than the area comprising properties off Meltham Road around Lockwood Cemetery. It would also comprise properties off Hawkroyd Bank Road around Kestrel Bank, and to the north of Lockwood Road and to the west of Upper Mount Street, and also the roads off Springdale Avenue from the existing Newsome ward. Finally, it would also comprise two small areas from the existing Paddock ward. Their revised Golcar ward would reflect the transfers to their proposed Colne Valley and Lindley wards as well as the transfers from the existing Colne Valley West, Lindley and Paddock wards. Their revised Newsome ward would reflect the transfers to and from their proposed Crosland Moor ward and would also gain part of the existing Paddock ward. It would also gain part of the existing Deighton ward and two parts of the existing Almondbury ward. Longwood Village Group submitted proposals intended to unite Longwood village in the same borough ward. It proposed that polling districts GO5 and GO9 be transferred to its revised Colne West and Paddock wards respectively. It also proposed that polling district LI7 and part of polling district LI5 (the area to the south of New Hey Road) be transferred from the existing Lindley ward to its revised Golcar ward, which would be renamed Golcar & Longwood ward.

104 Having considered the proposals made by the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council, we proposed to broadly adopt their proposed wards in this area, subject to a number of minor amendments. In particular, we considered that they achieved a good balance between electoral equality and community identity in their proposed Colne Valley ward as, although it would be geographically large, it achieved a good level of electoral equality while retaining a mainly rural composition. We proposed that the boundary between Crosland Moor and Newsome wards be amended to follow the boundary of Old Spring Wood, transferring properties at the western end of Wood End Road to our proposed Newsome ward. We also proposed utilising Meltham Road as a boundary around Lockwood Cemetery instead of following the rear of properties in order to utilise a stronger boundary. We proposed that the boundary between our proposed Crosland Moor and Newsome wards should follow the rear of properties on the eastern side of Mount Street as this would retain Mount Street and Upper Mount Street in the same ward. Finally, we proposed that the boundary between Colne Valley and Golcar wards

should follow the rear of all properties on Brook Lane to avoid splitting the road between two wards.

105 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor would be 1% below the borough average in Colne Valley ward, both in 2001 and by 2006, equal to the average in Crosland Moor ward (1% below by 2006), 2% above in Golcar ward (3% above by 2006) and 2% above in Newsome ward (1% below by 2006).

106 At Stage Three, the Joint Submission put forward two minor amendments to the draft recommendations. It proposed that the boundary between Crosland Moor and Holme Valley North wards be revised so that the properties south of Church Lane would be in Crosland Moor ward. It proposed that the boundary should run along the track from James Lane, then east along the disused railway line to Meltham Road and the draft boundary. The Joint Submission also proposed that the whole of Beaumont Park should be within Crosland Moor ward, rather than split between the latter and Newsome ward. It argued that 'Beaumont Park itself is considered locally to be a part of Crosland Moor' and the flats in the centre of the park ought to be included in Crosland Moor ward. As a result of its Kirkburton parish proposals, the Conservative Group proposed a new Huddersfield South ward based on part of Newsome ward, (east of Oaken Bank Plantation and Martin Bank Wood, south of Ashenhurst Avenue, Stile Common and the cricket ground) and part of Almondbury ward approximately west of Greenside Mills, Fernside Crescent, Aldonley and south of Southfield Road.

107 Councillor Rutter and Councillor Sarwar proposed that Crosland Moor ward should be renamed Crosland Moor & Netherton 'as over a third of the proposed ward is the village of Netherton and the local residents of Netherton have a very strong identity'. A local resident noted that Blackmoorfoot hamlet is currently split between Colne Valley West ward and Holme Valley North ward. The resident stated that 'it would seem sensible from an administrative point of view that all the residences' should be in Colne Valley West ward. Another local resident expressed concern regarding the draft recommendation to transfer Salendine Nook from Lindley ward to Golcar ward, adding that Salendine Nook and Lindley are 'contiguous' yet Salendine Nook and Golcar 'share nothing' and 'are isolated from each other'.

108 We have carefully considered all the representations received, and we propose to broadly confirm our draft recommendations. We note the Joint Submission's proposal to include the whole of Church Lane within Crosland Moor ward. While we acknowledge that this proposal has some merit, we are unable to adopt it, as it would split Meltham parish and create a parish ward with too few electors. We note the Joint Submission's proposal to transfer part of Beaumont Park from Newsome ward, so that the whole park falls within Crosland Moor ward. We consider that this proposal would better reflect the local community, and would only affect 65 electors (70 by 2006), who have good access to Crosland Moor ward. Therefore we propose to move away from our draft recommendations and adopt the Joint Submission's proposal. We note the Conservative Group's proposal for a new Huddersfield South ward based on part of Almondbury ward and Newsome ward. However, we are not persuaded that its proposals for this area, as well as the rest of central Huddersfield, would improve upon our draft recommendations. It provided no argument in support of the new ward, which would result in considerable amendments to ward boundaries and affect a significant number of electors, as detailed previously.

109 We also note Councillor Rutter and Councillor Sarwar's proposal to change the ward name of Crosland Moor to Crosland Moor & Netherton. We accept that Crosland Moor ward includes the majority of Netherton, and we therefore propose to change the ward name to Crosland Moor & Netherton, in order to better reflect community identity. We note the local resident's proposal to include Blackmoorfoot hamlet within one ward. We acknowledge that this proposal has some merit. However, we are unable to adopt it, as it would also split Meltham parish and create a parish ward with too few electors. We are not persuaded by the local resident's objections to the draft recommendation to transfer Salendine Nook from Lindley ward

into Golcar ward. This would increase the electoral variance of Lindley ward to 10% above the borough average by 2006, and we do not consider that sufficient argumentation was provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.

110 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Colne Valley ward would be 1% below the borough average both in 2001 and by 2006, equal to the average in Crosland Moor & Nethererton ward both in 2001 and by 2006, 2% above in Golcar ward (3% above by 2006) and 1% above in Newsome ward (3% below by 2006).

Holme Valley North and Holme Valley South wards

111 These two wards are situated in the south of the borough. Holme Valley North ward contains Meltham parish and Honley Central, Honley East, Honley South, Honley West and Thurstonland parish wards of Holme Valley parish. Holme Valley South ward contains the remainder of Holme Valley parish, which comprises Austonley, Cartworth, Fulstone, Hepworth, Holme, Netherthong, North Central, Scholes, South Central, Uppertong and Wooldale parish wards. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor is 2% above the borough average in Holme Valley North ward (4% above by 2006) and 11% above in Holme Valley South ward (15% above by 2006).

112 At Stage One, as part of their Joint Submission, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed retaining the existing Holme Valley North and Holme Valley South wards. Although Holme Valley South ward would be under-represented by 11% by 2006, the Council argued, that since this ward is at the very south of the borough, alternative options are limited and any transfers would divide the communities of Holme Valley parish. Holme Valley Parish Council proposed amendments to the existing parish ward boundaries within Holme Valley parish and a reduction in the number of parish councillors, detailed later.

113 We examined alternative boundaries between the two Holme Valley wards in order to achieve better levels of electoral equality. However, the parish is made up of several distinct settlements which are accommodated by the existing boundary. We considered that amending the boundary between the two wards would result in an arbitrary boundary and would also have an impact upon the Parish Council's proposals for amendments to its internal parish electoral arrangements which it had submitted. The parish is also at the very south of the borough, bounded to the east by other parishes and to the west by Wessenden Moor, offering few alternatives. Therefore, other than a minor amendment so that the boundary should follow the A6024 as proposed by Holme Valley Parish Council, we proposed to adopt these two wards as proposed in the Joint Submission.

114 Under our draft recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2% below the borough average in Holme Valley North ward (1% below by 2006) and 7% above in Holme Valley South ward (11% above by 2006).

115 At Stage Three the Joint Submission put forward proposals regarding the boundary between Crosland Moor ward and Holme Valley North ward, detailed previously. A local resident put forward a proposal regarding the boundary between Colne Valley West ward and Holme Valley North ward, also detailed previously. Having considered both proposals we are unable to adopt either of them, as they would split parishes and create a parish ward with too few electors. Holme Valley Parish Council stated that it was content that its proposals at Stage One had been adopted. After establishing the exact nature of the parish boundary anomalies referred to in the draft recommendations, the Parish Council decided that as 'such strong differing opinions' were expressed by members, it would not recommend any change to the boundaries.

116 We therefore propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Holme Valley North and Holme Valley South wards as final.

117 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 2% below the borough average in Holme Valley North ward (1% below by 2006) and 7% above in Holme Valley South ward (11% above by 2006).

Electoral cycle

118 Under section 7(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, all metropolitan boroughs have a system of elections by thirds.

Conclusions

119 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 three minor changes to the boundary between Batley East and Dewsbury East ward to better reflect community identity.
- we propose to transfer Field Head Farm from Batley West ward to Heckmondwike ward to ensure that the farm is within the ward where its entrance is located.
- we propose to transfer the area of Batley West ward north of Bradford Road into Batley East ward, in order to better reflect community identity.
- we propose to change the name of Crosland Moor ward to Crosland Moor & Netherton ward in order to better reflect the constituent communities.
- we propose to include the whole of Beaumont Park within Crosland Moor & Netherton ward in order to better reflect community identity
- we propose to amend the boundary between Crosland Moor & Netherton ward so it follows the canal in order to create a clearer boundary.
- we propose to retain the Castle Hill area of Newsome ward in Almondbury ward in order to better reflect community identity.
- we propose to change the name of Liversedge ward to Liversedge & Gomersal ward in order to better reflect the constituent communities.
- we propose to change the name of Oakwell ward to Birstall & Birkenshaw ward in order to better reflect the constituent communities.

120 We conclude that, in Kirklees.

- there should be a reduction in council size from 72 to 69;
- there should be 23 wards, one fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 23 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward, and one ward should retain its existing boundaries.

121 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	72	69	72	69
Number of wards	24	23	24	23
Average number of electors per councillor	4,048	4,224	4,231	4,415
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	9	1	11	2
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	1	0	2	0

122 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 nine to one, with no wards varying by more than 20% from the borough average. By 2006 only two wards (Mirfield and Holme Valley South wards) are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final recommendation

Kirklees Metropolitan Council should comprise 69 councillors serving 23 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A and the large maps.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

123 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. In our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for Holme Valley and Kirkburton parishes to reflect the proposed borough wards.

124 The parish of Holme Valley is currently served by 31 councillors representing 16 wards: Honley Central, which is represented by four parish councillors, Fulstone and Wooldale (three), Austonley, Cartworth, Honley East, Netherthong, North Central, Scholes, South Central and Upperthong (two) and Hepworth, Holme, Honley South, Honley West and Thurstonland (one).

125 At Stage One, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that Holme Valley parish continue to be served by two borough wards, as at present, but made no specific proposals for the internal parishing arrangements.

126 Holme Valley Parish Council proposed alterations to the parish ward boundaries and a reduction in the number of councillors serving the parish from 31 to 23. Having considered the evidence received and in the light of the fact that our borough warding would be unaffected by these proposals, other than a minor amendment between our proposed Holme Valley North and Holme Valley South wards, we considered Holme Valley Parish Council's request reasonable and put these forward as part of our draft recommendations.

127 In response to the consultation report, Holme Valley Parish Council supported our draft recommendations. No further comments were received.

128 Having considered all the evidence received, and in light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we confirm the draft recommendation for warding Holme Valley parish as final.

Final recommendation

Holme Valley Parish Council should comprise 23 councillors, eight fewer than at present, representing 12 wards: Brockholes (returning one councillor), Fulstone (two), Hepworth (one), Holmfirth Central (two), Honley Central & East (three), Honley South (one), Honley West (two), Netherthong (two), Scholes (two), Upper Holme Valley (two), Upperthong (two) and Wooldale (three). The parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on the large maps.

129 The parish of Kirkburton is currently served by 25 councillors representing eight wards: Lepton and Kirkburton, which are each represented by five parish councillors, Kirkheaton (four), Shepley (three) and Flockton, Shelley, Thurstonland & Farnley Tyas and Whitley Upper (two).

130 At Stage One, the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Green groups on the Council proposed that Kirkburton parish continue to be served by three borough wards and made no proposals to change the existing Flockton, Kirkburton, Shelley, Shepley and Thurstonland & Farnley Tyas parish wards. However, they proposed that a modified Kirkheaton parish ward form part of their modified Dalton ward. They also proposed that a modified Lepton parish ward form part of their modified Almondbury ward. Finally, these modifications would result in consequential changes to the existing Whitley Upper ward, to be included in their modified Kirkburton borough ward.

131 Kirkburton Parish Council and Kirkburton & District Civic Society made no proposals for change to any of the existing parish wards but proposed that Kirkburton parish be served by two borough wards.

132 Having considered all the evidence received, and in the light of our draft recommendations for the borough warding in Kirkburton parish, reflecting our minor modification to the proposals made to the Joint Submission proposals, we proposed amendments to the parish accordingly. We proposed modified Kirkheaton and Lepton parish wards, while we proposed a modified Whitley Upper parish ward which we proposed naming Lepton & Whitley Upper parish ward to reflect the transfer of part of the existing Lepton parish ward. We did not propose any change in representation. However, we noted that this more significant transfer between the modified Lepton parish ward and our proposed Lepton & Whitley Upper parish ward improved the ratio of electors per councillor in these two parish wards, while there would be more of an imbalance in the other parish wards.

133 At Stage Three the Conservative Group objected to our draft recommendations for Kirkburton parish, and put forward proposals for two new Kirkburton wards, broadly based on parts of Kirkburton ward and Kirkburton parish, in order to avoid splitting Kirkburton parish between three wards. It stated that its proposals ensured that Kirkburton and Lepton would be 'wholly within the parish boundaries', and would retain the 'local identities' of Kirkburton ward, although it acknowledged Lepton would still be split between two wards. Kirkburton Parish Council expressed regret that its comments had not been adopted as part of the draft recommendations, and requested that its Stage One submission be reconsidered. It objected to the draft recommendations for Kirkburton parish, which transferred parts of Lepton to Almondbury ward and split the parish over three wards. Kirkburton and District Civic Society and two local residents objected to the draft recommendation to split an existing parish ward and transfer part of Lepton to Almondbury ward. The latter stated that the proposals would break the historical ties Lepton has with Kirkburton parish, and the Civic Society stated that the parish should be divided between two wards instead of three.

134 We have carefully considered the representations received. We note the proposals of the Conservative Group to create two new Kirkburton wards in order to prevent the further division of the parish and Lepton. However, we also note that, as the Conservative Group acknowledge, its proposals would still divide Lepton, transfer parts of the existing Almondbury and Dalton wards, and as a 'direct consequence of the changes proposed for the Kirkburton parish, a number of changes are requires (sic) in the inner Huddersfield area to equalise electorates to a reasonable level'. As detailed previously, we have not been persuaded that these proposals would improve upon our draft recommendations, and do not propose to adopt the Conservative Group's proposals for Kirkburton parish.

135 We note Kirkburton Parish Council, Kirkburton and District Civic Society and two local residents' concerns regarding the draft recommendations for Lepton village and Kirkburton parish. However, as we noted in our draft recommendations, it is not possible to avoid the division of Kirkburton parish over three wards without seriously impacting upon neighbouring ward boundaries. We are also constrained by the requirement to have wards divisible by three councillors. We therefore propose to confirm our draft recommendations for Kirkburton parish as final.

Final recommendation

Kirkburton Parish Council should comprise 25 councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Flockton (returning two councillors), Kirkburton (five), Kirkheaton (four), Lepton (five), Lepton & Whitley Upper (two), Shelley (two), Shepley (three) and Thurstonland & Farnley Tyas (two). The parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on the large maps.

Map 2: Final recommendations for Kirklees

6 What happens next?

136 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Kirklees 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).

137 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 9 September 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.

138 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

Appendix A

Final recommendations for Kirklees: Detailed mapping

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

Map A1 illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail on the large maps.

The **large maps** illustrate the proposed warding arrangements for Kirklees.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Kirklees: 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 establishes the name of the Order and when it will come into force.

Interpretation

This defines terms that are used in the Order.

Wards of the borough of Kirklees

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 borough of Kirklees

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.

Wards of the parish of ...

This describes how two parishes in Kirklees are being changed.

Maps

This requires Kirklees Metropolitan Council to make a print of the map available for public inspection.

Electoral registers

This requires the 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 the electoral change Order for Kirklees

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2003 No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The Borough of Kirklees (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 July 2003 on its review of the borough(d) of Kirklees:

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 Borough of Kirklees (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 the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004, on 15th October 2003;

-
- (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 Kirklees has the status of a borough.
- (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.

- (b) for all other purposes, on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Interpretation

2. In this Order –

“borough” means the borough of Kirklees;

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

any reference to the map is a reference to the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Kirklees (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 Kirklees Metropolitan Council; and

any reference to a numbered sheet is a reference to the sheet of the map which bears that number.

Wards of the borough of Kirklees

3.—(1) The existing wards of the borough(a) shall be abolished.

- (2) The borough shall be divided into twenty-three 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 borough of Kirklees

4.—(1) Elections of all councillors for all wards of the borough shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004(b)(c).

- (2) The councillors holding office for any ward of the borough immediately before the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 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.

(a) See the Borough of Kirklees (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980 (S.I. 1980/1463).

(b) 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. 1980/1463.

(c) 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).

Wards of the parish of Holme Valley

- 5.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Holme Valley shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into twelve parish wards which shall bear the names Brockholes, Fulstone, Hepworth, Holmfirth Central, Honley Central and East, Honley South, Honley West, Netherthong, Scholes, Upper Holme Valley, Upperrthong and Wooldale; and the wards shall comprise the areas designated on sheets 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 11 by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by orange lines.
- (3) The number of councillors to be elected for each of the Honley Central and East, and Wooldale parish wards shall be three, for each of the Fulstone, Holmfirth Central, Honley West, Netherthong, Scholes, Upper Holme Valley and Upperrthong parish wards shall be two, and for each of the Brockholes, Hepworth and Honley South parish wards shall be one.

Wards of the parish of Kirkburton

- 6.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Kirkburton shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into eight parish wards which shall bear the names Flockton, Kirkburton, Kirkheaton, Lepton, Lepton and Whitley Upper, Shelley, Shepley, and Thurstonland and Farnley Tyas; and the wards shall comprise the areas designated on sheets 5, 6, 9 and 10 by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by orange lines.
- (3) The number of councillors to be elected for each of the Kirkburton and Lepton parish wards shall be five, for the Kirkheaton parish ward shall be four, for the Shepley parish ward shall be three, and for each of the Flockton, Lepton and Whitley Upper, Shelley, and Thurstonland and Farnley Tyas parish wards shall be two.

Maps

7. Kirklees Metropolitan Council shall make a print of the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Kirklees (Electoral Changes) Order 2003” available for inspection at its offices by any member of the public at any reasonable time.

Electoral registers

8. The Electoral Registration Officer(a) for the borough 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

9. The Borough of Kirklees (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980(b) 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

(a) 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).

(b) S.I. 1980/1463.

Date *Neil McIntosh*
Commissioner

Date *Karamjit Singh*
Commissioner

Date *Sam Younger*
Commissioner

Date *Graham Zellick*
Commissioner

SCHEDULE

article 3

NAMES OF WARDS

Almondbury	Dalton	Holme Valley North
Ashbrow	Denby Dale	Holme Valley South
Batley East	Dewsbury East	Kirkburton
Batley West	Dewsbury South	Lindley
Birstall and Birkenshaw	Dewsbury West	Liversedge and Gomersal
Cleckheaton	Golcar	Mirfield
Colne Valley	Greenhead	Newsome
Crosland Moor and Netherton	Heckmondwike	

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 borough of Kirklees.

The modifications are *indicate the modifications*.

The changes have effect in relation to local government elections to be held on and after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the borough and provides for the creation of 23 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.

Articles 5 and 6 make electoral changes in the parishes of Holme Valley and Kirkburton.

Article 8 obliges the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary amendments to the electoral register to reflect the new electoral arrangements.

Article 9 revokes the Borough of Kirklees (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980, with the exception of articles 8 and 9(7).

The areas of the new borough and parish 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 Kirklees Metropolitan Council and at the principal office of the Electoral Commission at Trevelyan House, Great Peter Street, London SW1P 2HW.