

# Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Salford

*February 2003*

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

# Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1. Introduction	11
2. Current electoral arrangements	13
3. Submissions received	17
4. Analysis and draft recommendations	19
5. What happens next?	39
Appendices	
A Draft recommendations for Salford: Detailed mapping	41
B Code of practice on written consultation	43



# 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  
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.



# Summary

We began a review of the electoral arrangements for Salford on 8 May 2002.

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

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

- **in 15 of the 20 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city and nine wards vary by more than 20% from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to improve slightly, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 14 wards and by more than 20% in eight wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 137–138) are that:

- **Salford City Council should have 60 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 20 wards, as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified and one ward should retain its existing boundaries.**

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

- **In 16 of the proposed 20 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further with the number of electors per councillor in 19 wards expected to vary by no more than 10% from the average for the city in 2006.**

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

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

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

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

Table 1: Draft recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large Map reference
1	Barton	3	Part of Barton ward, part of Eccles ward, part of Weaste & Seedley ward, part of Winton ward	2 and 3
2	Boothstown & Ellenbrook	3	Part of Walkden South ward, part of Worsley & Boothstown ward	1 and 3
3	Broughton	3	Part of Blackfriars ward, Broughton ward, part of Kersal ward	2
4	Cadishead	3	Cadishead ward, part of Irlam ward	3
5	Claremont	3	Part of Claremont ward, part of Swinton South ward	2
6	Eccles	3	Part of Eccles ward, part of Swinton South ward	2
7	Irlam	3	Part of Barton ward, part of Irlam ward, part of Winton ward	3
8	Kersal	3	Part of Kersal ward	2
9	Langworthy	3	Part of Blackfriars ward, part of Claremont ward, Langworthy ward, part of Pendleton ward, part of Weaste & Seedley ward	2
10	Little Hulton	3	Little Hulton ward, part of Walkden South ward	1
11	Ordsall	3	Part of Blackfriars ward, part of Ordsall ward, part of Weaste & Seedley ward	2
12	Pendlebury	3	Part of Pendlebury ward, part of Swinton South	2
13	Swinton North	3	Part of Swinton North ward	1 and 2
14	Swinton South	3	Part of Pendlebury ward, part of Swinton North ward, part of Swinton South ward	2
15	Trinity & Crescent	3	Part of Blackfriars ward, part of Claremont, part of Pendlebury ward, part of Pendleton ward	2
16	Walkden North	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (existing Walkden North ward)	1 and 2
17	Walkden South	3	Part of Walkden South ward	1

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Large Map reference</b>
18	Weaste & Seedley	3	Part of Claremont ward, part of Ordsall ward, part of Weaste & Seedley ward	2
19	Winton	3	Part of Winton ward, part of Worsley & Boothstown ward	1,2 and 3
20	Worsley	3	Part of Swinton South ward, part of Winton ward, part of Worsley & Boothstown ward	1 and 2

*Notes:*

- 1) *The city is unparished*
- 2) *The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.*
- 3) *We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.*

Table 2: Draft recommendations for Salford

	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	Barton	3	8,761	2,920	9	8,525	2,842	5
2	Boothstown & Ellenbrook	3	7,595	2,532	-5	7,731	2,577	-4
3	Broughton	3	8,552	2,851	6	8,291	2,764	3
4	Cadishead	3	6,797	2,266	-15	7,154	2,385	-12
5	Claremont	3	8,301	2,767	3	8,225	2,742	2
6	Eccles	3	8,295	2,765	3	8,422	2,807	4
7	Irlam	3	7,152	2,384	-11	7,468	2,489	-8
8	Kersal	3	7,952	2,651	-1	8,253	2,751	2
9	Langworthy	3	9,577	3,192	19	8,543	2,848	6
10	Little Hulton	3	8,763	2,921	9	8,330	2,777	3
11	Ordsall	3	5,433	1,811	-32	7,441	2,480	-8
12	Pendlebury	3	8,184	2,728	2	8,155	2,718	1
13	Swinton North	3	8,399	2,800	5	8,490	2,830	5
14	Swinton South	3	8,440	2,813	5	8,455	2,818	5
15	Trinity & Crescent	3	7,703	2,568	-4	7,544	2,515	-7
16	Walkden North	3	8,116	2,705	1	7,903	2,634	-2
17	Walkden South	3	8,057	2,686	0	8,364	2,788	3
18	Weaste & Seedley	3	8,068	2,689	0	7,662	2,554	-5
19	Winton	3	8,474	2,825	5	8,325	2,775	3
20	Worsley	3	8,117	2,706	1	8,411	2,804	4
	Totals	<b>60</b>	<b>160,736</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>161,692</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Averages	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,679</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,695</b>	<b>-</b>

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

*2. There is a small anomaly between the 2006 electorate totals in tables 2 and 4. This is due to rounding.*

# 1 Introduction

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Salford. Salford's last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1979 (Report no. 347).

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

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

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Salford is being 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 to The Electoral Commission on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

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

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

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit on the number of councillors which can be returned from each metropolitan borough 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 result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

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

Table 3: Stages of the review

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

10 Stage One began on 8 May 2002, when we wrote to Salford City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the Greater Manchester Police Authority, the Local Government Association, The National Association of Local Councils, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, Members of the European Parliament for the North West Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Salford City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 2002.

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

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

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

## 2 Current electoral arrangements

14 Salford is a busy, changing city in south-west Greater Manchester. The city was created as a result of an amalgamation of five previously diverse towns, each with their own particular community identity. At local government reorganisation in 1974, the towns of Salford, Eccles, Worsley, Swinton & Pendlebury and Irlam were brought together as the City of Salford with the administrative centre being based in Swinton.

15 The city is bounded to the south by the Manchester Ship canal, and the M60, M61, M62 and M602 motorways, together with a number of major rail routes serving the Greater Manchester area, traverse the city. The city also contains a number of significant waterways including the River Irwell and major roads including the A57 (Liverpool Road), A580 (East Lancashire Road) and A6 (Manchester Road). The city is unparished.

16 The electorate of the city is 160,736 (December 2001). The Council presently has 60 members who are elected from 20 wards, which in the east and centre are urban in nature and in the west, relatively rural. All wards are three-member wards.

17 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,679 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 2,695 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 15 of the 20 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average, nine wards by more than 20% and four wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Walkden South ward where each of the councillors represents 50% more electors than the city average.

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

*Map 1: Existing wards in Salford*

Table 4: Existing electoral arrangements

	Wardname	Number of Councillors	Electorate 2001	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate 2006	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barton	3	7,582	2,527	-6	7,357	2,452	-9
2	Blackfriars	3	5,697	1,899	-29	7,574	2,525	-6
3	Broughton	3	5,711	1,904	-29	5,310	1,770	-34
4	Cadishead	3	6,529	2,176	-19	6,883	2,294	-15
5	Claremont	3	9,714	3,238	21	9,633	3,211	19
6	Eccles	3	9,038	3,013	12	9,166	3,055	13
7	Irlam	3	7,403	2,468	-8	7,723	2,574	-4
8	Kersal	3	8,508	2,836	6	8,799	2,933	9
9	Langworthy	3	5,362	1,787	-33	4,649	1,550	-42
10	Little Hulton	3	6,994	2,331	-13	6,530	2,177	-19
11	Ordsall	3	4,981	1,660	-38	5,353	1,784	-34
12	Pendlebury	3	10,322	3,441	28	10,244	3,415	27
13	Pendleton	3	6,503	2,168	-19	5,964	1,988	-26
14	Swinton North	3	8,970	2,990	12	9,049	3,016	12
15	Swinton South	3	9,810	3,270	22	9,918	3,306	23
16	Walkden North	3	8,116	2,705	1	7,903	2,634	-2
17	Walkden South	3	12,071	4,024	50	12,449	4,150	54
18	Weaste & Seedley	3	7,275	2,425	-9	6,839	2,280	-15
19	Winton	3	8,927	2,976	11	8,769	2,923	8
20	Worsley & Boothstown	3	11,223	3,741	40	11,583	3,861	43
	Totals	<b>60</b>	<b>160,736</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>161,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	Averages	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,679</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>2,695</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Salford City 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 city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Ordsall ward were relatively over-represented by 38%, while electors in Walkden South ward were relatively under-represented by 50%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

*2. There is a small anomaly between the 2006 electorate totals in tables 2 and 4. This is due to rounding.*



### 3 Submissions received

19 At the start of the review members of the public and other interested parties were invited to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Salford City Council.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the BCFE visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received six representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council, the Conservatives and Hope Action Group, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council.

#### Salford City Council

21 Following an extensive consultation process, Salford City Council put forward a city-wide scheme based on the existing council size of 60. In relation to council size, consideration was given to recently introduced political management structures within Salford, including arrangements within the city for local working, based on groupings of wards through community committees.

22 The City Council's proposals resulted in amendments to all but one of the existing wards, with detailed individual ward profiles provided containing evidence and argumentation. Under the City Council's proposals, all wards would vary by less than 5% from the city average by 2006. A joint submission was also received from each of the political group leaders, supporting the retention of 60 councillors.

#### The City of Salford Council Conservative Group & The Eccles, Salford & Worsley Constituency Conservative Associations

23 The City of Salford Council Conservative Group & The Eccles, Salford & Worsley Constituency Conservative Associations (the Conservatives) put forward a city-wide scheme based on the existing council size of 60. The proposals provided for the creation of 20 revised wards, all of which would vary by less than 7% from the city average by 2006. Limited argumentation was provided for each of the proposed wards and the scheme did not appear to have been subject to local consultation.

#### Salford Constituency Liberal Democrats

24 Salford Constituency Liberal Democrats (the Liberal Democrats) put forward proposals for the Salford Constituency area. They contended that their proposals aimed to minimise the effects on existing community groups, causing as little disruption as possible. The scheme was not supported by any evidence and argumentation and was not subject to consultation. All seven of their proposed wards would vary by less than 9% from the city average by 2006.

#### Hope Action Group

25 A city-wide scheme was also received from Hope Action Group. The proposals were based on the existing council size of 60 and the submission contended that it was based largely on the existing community and neighbourhood groups within the city, particularly within the Hope area. Limited argumentation was included in support of these proposals and they did not appear to have been consulted on. Under Hope Action Group's proposals, all wards would vary by less than 8% from the city average by 2006.

## Other representations

26 Finally, Home Watch, an organisation based in the Hope area, commented on the City Council's proposals, arguing that no thought or consideration had been given to the alignment of boundaries with existing communities. A number of observations were put forward in relation to the City Council's proposals, with strong support being expressed for community centred wards. The views expressed were similar to those conveyed by Hope Action Group.

## 4 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

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

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

30 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.

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

### Electorate forecasts

32 Since 1975 there has been approximately a 20% decrease in the electorate of Salford city. The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of less than 1% from 160,736 to 161,695 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Blackfriars ward in the east of the city, although a significant amount is also expected in a number of wards in the west of the city. However, a number of wards, predominantly in the centre of the city, would see a static or slight decline in electorate. 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 City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

33 Hope Action Group and Home Watch questioned the projected electorate figures. Hope Action Group stated that its proposals 'take account of known actual or likely development impact on electorate figures to a better extent than the City's proposals'. It argued that the City Council's projections result in electorate decreases being put forward for some localities where the opposite appears to be the case on the ground. Finally, it stated that in some cases the number of new dwellings anticipated to be delivered by 2006 exceeds the stated anticipated total (planning) supply capacity.

34 Home Watch expressed concern regarding the City Council's 'population decline assessment' in the existing Weaste & Seedley ward. It argued that increased population had been noticed in the TG polling district area 'by the replacement of single occupancy property to multi-occupancy by families or conversion to apartments, whereas [polling district] areas TD, TE etc.. have increasing numbers of vacant properties due to the unpopularity of these areas'. It was stated 'I can only assume that there has been a political levelling out of numbers'.

35 Having received these views in relation to the forecast electorate, we sought further clarification from the City Council. The Council submitted a detailed response in relation to this issue, addressing each of the concerns raised at Stage One. It asserted the view that the occupied dwelling and electorate projections used to inform its submission are both realistic and achievable. In addition, it was stated that the electorate figures used were agreed by the Council on a cross-party basis.

36 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered the City Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. We would, however, welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

## Council size

37 Salford City Council at present has 60 members. The City Council proposed retaining the existing council size, with consideration being given to recently introduced political management structures within Salford, including arrangements within the city for local working based on groupings of wards through community committees. A joint submission was also received from each of the political group leaders, supporting the retention of 60 councillors. The submission from Hope Action Group was also based on the existing council size of 60, although no specific reference was made to the issue of council size.

38 Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 60 members.

## Electoral arrangements

39 Having given careful consideration to all of the representations received at Stage One, we consider that all three city-wide schemes have some merit, providing for good levels of electoral equality and, on the whole, utilising strong boundaries. We note that there is a level of consensus in the west of the city, but limited agreement on the most appropriate re-warding for the eastern area.

40 Having analysed each of the schemes, and with officers from the Committee having visited the area, we are of the view that the proposals put forward by the Conservatives and Hope Action Group and the partial scheme submitted by the Liberal Democrats contain revised warding arrangements which we are not persuaded provide for an adequate reflection of the statutory criteria and subsequently weaken the schemes as a whole. In addition, we received limited or no evidence and argumentation in support of these alternative proposals. As stated in the *Guidance*, 'representations which provide evidence in support of a particular proposition are likely to carry more weight than those which simply assert a point of view'.

41 In relation to the Conservatives' scheme, we note that limited argumentation and evidence was received. In addition, we are not persuaded by their proposals in the extreme east of the city, particularly their proposed Kersal and Blackfriars wards which breach the River Irwell

(which was identified as a boundary under the alternative schemes) as well as combining disparate communities which we consider to have limited transport and communication links.

42 We are of the view that the proposals submitted by Hope Action Group have some merit; however, we are concerned that the scheme was derived from the desire to re-ward the Hope area in a particular way, and with limited thought and argumentation being given to the consequent effects of the scheme across the city as a whole. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we are not convinced that the proposals under this scheme for Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria, particularly in relation to the combining of the Hope area with part of the Eccles area to its west.

43 In relation to the partial scheme submitted by the Liberal Democrats, we note that no evidence or argumentation was provided in support of these proposals and that in addition, they were derived from the desire to retain the existing parliamentary constituency boundary. We are also not persuaded that the revised warding arrangements provide for an adequate reflection of the statutory criteria. This was particularly the case in relation to the proposed boundary between Pendleton West and Weaste & Seedley wards.

44 We note the views expressed by Home Watch. These views are similar to those conveyed by Hope Action Group, with specific reference made to the re-warding of the Hope area. As detailed above, we are not persuaded that the proposed re-warding in this area provides for the best reflection of the statutory criteria or that sufficient thought has been given to the consequent effect of the scheme across the city as a whole.

45 In view of these conclusions, the consultation exercise that the City Council undertook with interested parties, and the comprehensive argumentation and evidence provided, we have based our recommendations on the City Council's scheme. We consider that this scheme would provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the City Council's proposals in a number of areas. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) Cadishead and Irlam wards;
- b) Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley & Boothstown wards;
- c) Barton, Eccles and Winton wards;
- d) Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards;
- e) Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards;
- f) Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton wards;
- g) Broughton and Kersal wards.

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

## Cadishead and Irlam wards

47 The existing wards of Cadishead and Irlam are situated in the extreme south-west of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Cadishead and Irlam wards contain 19% and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (15% and 4% fewer by 2006).

48 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a revised Cadishead ward, largely based on the existing ward. A revised north-eastern boundary would cut through the relatively unpopulated area of Chat Moss and result in the Jenny Green area being transferred from the existing Irlam

ward to the proposed Cadishead ward. It was argued that the proposals maintain existing community integrity while ensuring an acceptable level of electoral equality. A revised Irlam ward would comprise the existing ward, less the area surrounding Jenny Green, as detailed above, together with the residential area that straddles the A57 Liverpool Road between Trident Road and Wilfred Road, from the existing Barton and Winton wards, which it argues is 'effectively cut off from the main urban areas of Eccles and Barton by the M60 motorway and Eccles Cemetery'.

49 Under the City Council's proposals, the revised Cadishead and Irlam wards would contain 9% and 8% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (both being 5% fewer by 2006).

50 The Conservatives proposed a revised Cadishead ward which was broadly similar to that proposed by the City Council but with a marginally different boundary between the wards of Cadishead and Irlam. The Conservatives reiterated the view of the Council with regard to the close links between the Cadishead and Irlam areas and that the choice of revised boundary between these two wards would not have a 'detrimental effect on the community'. A revised Irlam ward would comprise the existing ward, less the area in the south to be transferred to the proposed Cadishead ward, together with the settlements to the west of the M60 motorway from the existing Winton and Barton wards. The Conservatives argued that this provided for a 'more sensible boundary' and rectified the present situation of these areas being 'isolated as a community from their previous wards of Barton and Winton'.

51 Under the Conservatives' proposals Cadishead and Irlam wards would contain 5% fewer and 3% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (4% and 1% more by 2006).

52 At Stage One, Hope Action Group proposed a revised Cadishead ward which was broadly similar to that proposed by the City Council and the Conservatives, subject to a marginally different boundary between the proposed wards of Cadishead and Irlam. It stated the revised boundary ensured that all properties off Sandy Lane were in the same city ward. The revised Irlam ward would again be broadly similar to that proposed by the Conservatives (subject to the alternative boundary with Cadishead). Hope Action Group asserted the use of the M60 Motorway as an eastern boundary for the proposed ward, resulting in the transfer of the settlements to the west of the motorway to the proposed Irlam ward. It stated that these areas share similar issues with the rest of Irlam and the existing boundary in this area does not recognise the 'separating effect of the motorway'.

53 Under Hope Action Group's proposals Cadishead and Irlam wards would contain 2% fewer and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% and 3% more by 2006).

54 Home Watch expressed support for the views expressed by the Conservatives and Hope Action Group in relation to the use of the M60 Motorway as a eastern boundary for the revised Irlam ward. It argued that the settlements to the west of the motorway are 'a community, originally aligned to Eccles but now separated by the M60 motorway. Although remote there is a potential for alignment with Irlam to the west, if numbers dictate'.

55 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the proposals submitted by Salford City Council. We note that while there was broad agreement regarding the proposed boundary between the revised Cadishead and Irlam wards, conflicting views were expressed in relation to the use of the M60 motorway as an eastern boundary for the revised Irlam ward. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we conclude that in this part of the city, the M60 motorway does not form a significant barrier and that roads and paths both under and over the motorway link the settlements to the east and west. In addition, it was concluded that the settlements to

the west of the M60 motorway had more in common with the settlements to the east than with the communities centred in the south of the existing Irlam ward from which they are separated by large open space. We therefore conclude that the City Council's revised Irlam ward provides for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. However, based on our conclusions in this area, we were of the view that the City Council's proposals can be improved upon in order to provide for a better reflection of community identity. We therefore propose that the area to the west of the M60 surrounding Liverpool Road should form part of the revised Barton ward.

56 As a result of this amendment, it was necessary to amend the Council's proposed boundary between the revised Cadishead and Irlam wards in order to address the over-representation that would result in the revised Irlam ward. At Stage One, the view was expressed that the communities of Cadishead and Irlam are closely linked and that any revised boundary between them would have a negligible impact on community identity. We concur with this view and sought to determine a revised boundary which would be clearly identifiable while addressing the issue of electoral equality. We therefore propose a revised boundary based on the use of Springfield Lane and Liverpool Road.

57 By 2006 Cadishead ward will vary by 12% from the city average. While it could be argued that this level of electoral equality is higher than would normally be proposed for a predominantly urban area such as Salford, the ward concerned is more rural in nature and on the western edge of the city. We are also content that this variance can be argued on community identity grounds in relation to our amendment to the proposed Irlam ward. While we have tried to improve upon this level of electoral inequality, due to geographical constraints and locations of settlements in this area, we have been unable to improve upon a level of electoral equality of 12%. We would welcome views on this issue at Stage Three.

58 Under our draft recommendations, Cadishead and Irlam wards would contain 15% and 11% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (12% and 8% fewer by 2006).

## Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley & Boothstown wards

59 The existing wards of Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley & Boothstown are situated in the north and west of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Little Hulton ward contains 13% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (19% fewer by 2006); Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley & Boothstown wards contain 1%, 50% and 40% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% fewer, 54% more and 43% more by 2006).

60 At Stage One, the City Council proposed retaining the existing Walkden North ward. It argued that the existing ward is separated from neighbouring wards by a number of 'recognisable topographical divisions' as well as providing for an acceptable level of electoral equality. It also proposed broadly retaining the existing Little Hulton ward, subject to an amendment to part of the eastern boundary, resulting in the inclusion of the area broadly to the west of Hilton Lane from the existing Walkden South ward. The Council argued that this amendment provided for a more clearly identifiable boundary as the existing boundary cut through an existing community and was 'a longstanding source of confusion for residents'. The remaining part of the existing Walkden South ward, less the Ellenbrook housing area, as detailed below, would form a revised Walkden South ward. It was argued that the Ellenbrook housing area is separated from the west of Walkden South ward by a 'disused railway embankment' and therefore has closer links with the areas to its south.

61 Finally, the City Council proposed two new wards, Boothstown and Worsley, which are broadly based on the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward areas. The new Boothstown ward would comprise the Boothstown area from the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward, together

with the Ellenbrook housing area from the existing Walkden South ward, as detailed above. The Council stated that this ward 'represents a highly, self-contained community'. The revised Worsley ward would comprise the remainder of the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward, less the area to the south of the M62 motorway, together with the area to the west of Folly Brook from the existing Swinton South ward. It was argued that this area has closer links with Worsley than with Swinton.

62 Under the City Council's proposals, Boothstown, Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley wards would contain 5% fewer, 9% more, 1% more, equal to the average and 1% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (4% fewer, 3% more, 2% fewer, 3% more and 4% more by 2006).

63 The Conservatives' proposals in this area were identical in to the Council's in relation to the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward area. They proposed a revised Boothstown & Ellenbrook ward which was identical to the Council's proposed Boothstown ward. They stated that the two communities of Boothstown and Ellenbrook are well linked by Ellenbrook Road and that while the East Lancashire Road might be considered as a barrier 'this is not the case with this proposed new ward'. They proposed a revised Worsley ward which was identical to that proposed by the City Council, subject to a marginally different southern boundary (which affected no electors). They argued that the proposed ward contains a number of communities that work together. They also advocated the inclusion of part of the existing Swinton South ward stating that this area 'considers itself part of Worsley rather than Swinton'.

64 The Conservatives proposed a revised Little Hulton ward, which would comprise the existing ward, together with the area surrounding Coniston Avenue and West Way from the existing Walkden North ward. The Conservatives stated that the inclusion of this area addressed the issue of over-representation which currently exists and that these 'changes do not affect the community as the additional area is already considered to be part of Little Hulton'. Part of the remaining part of the existing Walkden North ward, the area broadly to the west of Sharp Street, would be combined with part of the existing Walkden South ward, the area broadly to the west of the B5232 (Bridgewater Road), to form a new Blackleach ward, which it was argued 'is an attempt to create a single new identity'. Finally, the remaining parts of the existing Walkden North and Walkden South wards would be combined to form a new Linnyslaw & Park ward. The Conservatives argued that these two areas were part of the same ward prior to 1979 boundary changes. They also asserted the view that 'A majority of the housing within this new ward is situated around the town centre of Walkden, which acts as a focal point of the whole area'.

65 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Blackleach, Boothstown & Ellenbrook, Linnyslaw & Park, Little Hulton and Worsley wards would contain 8% more, 5% fewer, 8% fewer, 10% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (6% more, 4% fewer, 5% fewer, 3% more and 4% more by 2006).

66 Hope Action Group proposed broadly similar proposals in this area to those put forward by the City Council. It also stated that they were identical to those proposed by Councillor Boyd, although Councillor Boyd's proposals were not submitted to us during Stage One. It proposed a revised ward 9, which was identical to the City Council's proposed Boothstown ward and the Conservatives' proposed Boothstown & Ellenbrook ward. It also proposed retaining the existing Walkden North ward (ward 12), as did the City Council. It proposed a revised Little Hulton ward (ward 11) which was broadly similar to that proposed by the City Council, subject to a marginally different eastern boundary. It proposed that the area surrounding Fairhurst Drive be incorporated in its proposed ward 11. The remaining part of the existing Walkden South ward, less the Ellenbrook area which would form part of the proposed ward 9, as detailed above, and the area bounded by Walkden Road and the railway line, as detailed below would form Hope Action Group's proposed ward 10. Finally, the remaining part of the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward (the Worsley area) would be combined with the area bounded by Walkden

Road and the railway line from the existing Walkden South ward, as detailed above to form the proposed ward 13.

67 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, wards 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 would contain 5% fewer, 11% fewer, 2% fewer, 1% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (5%, 8%, 8%, 2% and 2% fewer by 2006).

68 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which were similar in part to the proposals put forward by the Conservatives and Hope Action Group. We consider that each of the proposals in this area have merit, utilising strong boundaries and providing for improved levels of electoral equality. However, we have not been persuaded by elements of each of the schemes put forward by the Conservatives and Hope Action Group. We concur with the views expressed by the City Council and the Conservatives that the East Lancashire Road forms a significant boundary in this area and are therefore not persuaded by Hope Action Group's proposed ward 13 which unites the area to the north of this barrier with the settlements to the south. In addition we concur with the views expressed by the City Council and Hope Action Group that the A6 (Manchester Road) forms a significant boundary and have therefore not been persuaded by the Conservatives' proposals in this area, which result in the boundary being breached under both their proposed Linnyslaw & Park and Blackleach wards.

69 On balance we consider that the City Council's proposals provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We do, however, propose a minor amendment to the eastern boundary of the proposed Worsley ward in order for Folly Brook to be used as a boundary in its entirety, together with adopting the Conservatives' proposed ward name of Boothstown & Ellenbrook, which we consider to be a better reflection of the constituent parts of this new ward.

70 Under our draft recommendations, Boothstown & Ellenbrook, Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley wards would contain 5% fewer, 9% more, 1% more, equal to the average and 1% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (4% fewer, 3% more, 2% fewer, 3% more and 4% more by 2006).

## Barton, Eccles and Winton wards

71 The existing wards of Barton, Eccles and Winton are situated in the south-central part of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Barton ward contains 6% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (9% fewer by 2006). Eccles and Winton wards contain 12% and 11% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (13% and 8% more by 2006).

72 At Stage One, the City Council proposed broadly retaining the existing Winton ward, less the settlement to the north of the A57 Liverpool Road, which would form part of the proposed Irlam ward, as detailed above, together with the area to the south of the M62 motorway from the existing Worsley & Boothstown ward, also detailed above. The Council stated that the revised Winton ward is formed of strong boundaries and contains four identifiable sub-communities which although having their own identity, 'all consider themselves to belong to the wider community of Winton'. The revised Eccles ward would be largely based on the existing ward, subject to the transfer of the area surrounding Cromwell Road to the proposed Barton ward with which it is argued it has more affinity (particularly the Patricroft area). The Council argued that while the proposed ward contains areas which have their own identity, they all consider themselves to be part of the wider community of Eccles, with the Eccles Town Centre area, to the south of the M602, identified as a principal shopping and service centre.

73 Finally, a revised Barton ward would comprise the existing ward, less the settlement to the south of the A57 (Liverpool Road) which would form part of the proposed Irlam ward, as detailed above, together with the area surrounding Cromwell Road from the existing Eccles

ward, also detailed above. The Council argued that this area is well linked southwards, with many streets leading onto the A57. It is stated that the residents in this area see the A57 as their 'main road' and it is used for both shopping and recreational facilities.

74 Under the City Council's proposals, Barton, Eccles and Winton wards would contain equal to the average, 3% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3% fewer, 4% more and 3% more by 2006).

75 The Conservatives proposed a revised Eccles ward which would comprise the existing Barton ward, less the area to the west of the M60 motorway which would form part of the proposed Irlam ward, as detailed above, together with the area broadly bounded by the M602 and Devonshire Road from the existing Eccles ward. Part of the remaining part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly between Devonshire Road and the Bridgewater Canal would be combined with the existing Winton ward, less the area to the west of the M60 motorway, which would form part of the proposed Irlam ward, as detailed below, to form a new Winton & Patricroft ward. Part of the remaining part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly to the west of Chatsworth Road would be combined with part of the existing Swinton South ward, the area broadly to the east of Folly Brook and south of the East Lancashire Road to form a new Monton ward. The Conservatives argued that this part of the existing Swinton South ward has closer community links with Monton than with Swinton and that 'the new ward is further connected by the local schools, which serve each of the areas'. The remaining part of the existing Eccles ward would form part of a new Oakwood Park ward, as detailed below.

76 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Eccles, Monton and Winton & Patricroft wards would contain 6% more, 3% fewer and 4% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% more, 1% fewer and 2% more by 2006).

77 Hope Action Group proposed three revised wards in this area. It proposed a new Eccles West ward which would comprise the existing Winton ward, less the settlements to the west of M60 motorway, as detailed above, together with the area surrounding Cromwell Road from the existing Eccles ward and the area broadly bounded by Liverpool Road and Peel Green Road from the existing Barton ward. The remaining part of the existing Barton ward would be combined with part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly to the south of the M602 motorway and the railway line (less the Cromwell Road area) to form a new Eccles with Barton ward. Part of the remaining part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly to the west of Cavendish Road would be combined with part of the existing Swinton South ward, the area broadly to the south of the East Lancashire Road and west of Eccles College to form a new Monton with Broadoak ward. The remaining part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly to the east of Cavendish Road would form part of a new Ellesmere ward, as detailed below.

78 Under Hope Action Groups' proposals, Eccles West, Eccles with Barton and Monton with Broadoak wards would contain 7% more, 4% more and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3% more, equal to the average and 3% fewer by 2006).

79 Home Watch commented on the proposals in this area and asserted the view that the area surrounding Eccles College (which is currently in the existing Swinton South ward) would be better represented within a revised Eccles ward from which its communication links are served. It also stated that the College is isolated from the areas to its north by open ground and that this proposal would also take account of future development within the area.

80 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals. We consider that these proposals provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria than alternative proposals submitted at Stage One, as well as facilitating our proposals to the north and west. We do, however, propose an amendment to the proposed Barton ward to include the settlements to the west of the M60 motorway (surrounding Liverpool Road) as detailed above.

81 Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we consider that each of the proposals submitted in relation to this area have merit but that the City Council's proposals better reflect existing community identity. We considered whether the area broadly bounded by Liverpool Road and Peel Green Road would be better represented in a ward with the areas to the north of Liverpool Road, as proposed by Hope Action Group or south of Liverpool Road, as proposed by the City Council and the Conservatives. However, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we have concluded that Liverpool Road is a strong barrier at this point and that the aforementioned area has better links with the settlements to its east than to its north.

82 Under our draft recommendations Barton, Eccles and Winton wards would contain 9%, 3% and 5% more electors per councillor than the City average respectively (5%, 4% and 3% more by 2006).

## Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards

83 The existing wards of Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South are situated in the central and northern parts of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards contain 28%, 12% and 22% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (27%, 12% and 23% more by 2006).

84 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a revised Swinton North ward which would be largely based on the existing ward, less the area surrounding Moorside Primary School and the residential area to its east which it argued relates closely to the community within the adjacent existing ward of Swinton South. The revised Swinton South ward would comprise the existing ward, less the area to the west of Folly Brook which would form part of a new Worsley ward, as detailed above, and the areas bounded by Hospital Road and Bolton Road and surrounding Torrington Road, together with the area broadly to the south of Swinton Hall Road from the existing Pendlebury ward. The council argued that the communities north and south of Chorley Road are centred on the Swinton shopping precinct which is 'a social and community focus for residents'. The remaining part of the existing Swinton South ward would form part of the revised Claremont ward, as detailed below.

85 Finally, a revised Pendlebury ward would comprise the existing ward, less the area broadly to the south of Swinton Hall Road, as detailed above, and a small area of housing (off Langley Road) which is considered to have closer links with the Whit Lane Estate (in the neighbouring proposed ward of Trinity & Crescent, as detailed below) than with the existing Pendlebury ward.

86 Under the City Council's proposals, Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards would contain 2%, 5% and 6% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1%, 5% and 5% more by 2006).

87 The Conservatives proposed a new Clifton & Pendlebury ward which would be largely based on the existing Pendlebury ward, less the areas surrounding St John's Street and broadly to the south of Bolton Road, together with the area broadly north of Mossfield Road from the existing Swinton North ward. The Conservatives argued that the inclusion of the area to the south of Mossfield Road would, 'strengthen the community round the Clifton end of the ward as they have much more affinity to this area than they do the centre of Swinton'. The Conservatives proposed broadly retaining the existing Swinton North ward, subject to the inclusion of the area north of Mossfield Road in the proposed Pendlebury & Clifton ward, as detailed above and the proposal to rename the ward Swinton West. As detailed below, parts of the existing Swinton South ward would form part of new Worsley and Monton wards. Part of the remaining part of the existing Swinton South ward, the area broadly to the east of Overdale and open space to the south, would form part of a new Oakwood Park ward, as detailed below. Finally the remaining part of the existing Swinton South ward would be combined with the areas

to the south of Bolton Road and surrounding St John Road from the existing Pendlebury ward, as detailed above, to form a new Swinton East ward.

88 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Clifton & Pendlebury, Swinton East and Swinton West wards would contain 6% fewer, 1% more and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (7%, 1% and 4% fewer by 2006).

89 Hope Action Group's proposals in this area were similar to those put forward by the City Council. It proposed broadly retaining the existing Swinton North ward, subject to an amendment to the eastern boundary and changing the name to Swinton West. The proposed eastern boundary would result in the area surrounding Everton Street and Westbrook Road being transferred to the proposed Swinton ward, as detailed below. It proposed broadly retaining the existing Pendlebury ward, less the area broadly to the south of the railway line (less the High Bank Road area). Finally, it proposed a new Swinton ward which would comprise the existing Swinton South ward, less the area broadly to the south of the East Lancashire Road and west of Eccles College, as detailed above, together with the area surrounding Everton Street and Westbrook Road from the existing Swinton North ward and the area broadly to the south of the railway line (less the High Bank Road area) from the existing Pendlebury ward, as detailed above.

90 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, Pendlebury, Swinton and Swinton West wards would contain 3%, 3% and 2% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1%, 2% and 2% more by 2006).

91 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which were broadly similar to those put forward by Hope Action Group. We do, however, propose a minor amendment to the western boundary of the proposed Swinton South ward in order to utilise Folly Brook as a boundary for its entirety, as detailed above. We were not persuaded that the Conservatives' proposals in this area provided for an adequate reflection of the statutory criteria, particularly in relation to their proposed Clifton & Pendlebury ward which would breach the M60 motorway and Bolton Road, two significant boundaries in this area. While we consider that the proposals submitted by Hope Action Group have merit, they would not facilitate our proposals in the south and east of the city, as discussed above and below.

92 On balance, and with officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were persuaded that the City Council's proposals provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We did look at the possibility of combining the area surrounding Hillside Drive with the Duchy Estate with which it would appear to have good transport links. However, officers from Committee having visited the area identified the boundary between these two settlements (which was retained under each of the city-wide schemes) as being a natural break and that the two settlements do appear to be somewhat different in character. We therefore propose retaining this boundary as part of our draft recommendations but would welcome further views on this issue at Stage Three. In relation to ward names, we note that both the Conservatives and Hope Action Group proposed changing the existing ward name of Swinton North to Swinton West, while the City Council proposed retaining the name of Swinton North. As we propose basing our draft recommendation on the City Council's proposals we propose retaining the name of Swinton North. We do, however, welcome further views on this issue at Stage Three.

93 Under our draft recommendation, Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards would contain, 2%, 5% and 5% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1%, 5% and 5% more by 2006).

## Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards

94 The existing wards of Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley are situated in the central and southern parts of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Claremont ward contains 21% more electors per councillor than the city average (19% more by 2006). Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards contain 33% and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (42% and 15% fewer by 2006).

95 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a revised Claremont ward which would be based on the existing ward, less the Duchy estate, the area broadly bounded by Light Oaks Road and Claremont Road and the area broadly to the south of Chaseley Road and east of Buile Hill High School, together with the areas bounded by Hospital Road and Bolton Road and surrounding Torrington Road from the existing Swinton South ward, as detailed above. The Council stated that a focal point for the ward is the facilities provided close to the roundabout on the A6 and that the areas to be included share more links with Claremont than with Swinton. A revised Langworthy ward would comprise the existing ward, together with the area broadly to the east of Buile Hill Park (surrounding Seedley Terrace) from the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area broadly to the south of Chaseley Road and east of Buile Hill High School from the existing Claremont ward, as detailed above, and the area to the south of Broad Street from the existing Pendleton ward. It argued that the inclusion of these areas was logical as they 'are centred around Salford Precinct and the main shopping centre, Salford Shopping City and are now considered to be part of that greater community'. The inclusion of part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward was justified on the basis that this area is separated from the rest of Weaste & Seedley ward by Buile Hill Park.

96 Finally, a revised Weaste & Seedley ward would comprise the existing ward, less the area broadly to the east of Buile Hill Park (surrounding Seedley Terrace), as detailed above, together with the area broadly bounded by Light Oaks Road and Claremont Road from the existing Claremont ward. It was considered that this area has 'stronger ties with the Hope part of Salford'.

97 Under the City Council's proposals, Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards would contain 3% more, 16% more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% more, 3% more and 5% fewer by 2006).

98 As discussed earlier, the Conservatives' proposed a new Oakwood Park ward which would comprise elements of the existing Eccles and Swinton South wards. The remainder of this ward would be formed from part of the existing Claremont ward, the area broadly to the west of Claremont Road and Park Lane. The remaining part of the existing Claremont ward would be combined with part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area broadly to the north of the M602 (less the area broadly bounded by Edward Avenue and Weaste Lane) to form a new Buile Hill ward. The Conservatives stated that 'It is hoped that the creation of this new ward, with a new name, will act as a catalyst to bring the community together into a cohesive and active body'.

99 Part of the remaining part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area broadly bounded by Edward Avenue and Weaste Lane, would be combined with the whole of the existing Langworthy ward, part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area broadly to the east of Hankinson Way and part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area surrounding the University of Salford, to form a new Langworth & Seedley ward. The Conservatives stated that this area has 'strong local community identity, which will not be fragmented by these changes'. Finally the remaining part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area to the south of the M602 would form part of a new Salford Quays ward, as detailed below.

100 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Buile Hill, Langworthy & Seedley and Oakwood Park wards would contain equal to the average, 12% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3% fewer, 2% fewer and 3% more by 2006).

101 Hope Action Group's proposals were significantly different to the City Council's proposals in this area which were accused of being 'strongly influenced by political self interest consideration'. It stated that its proposals sought to reconcile 'service and policy accountability difficulties which have arisen in the Hope neighbourhood'. It proposed a new New Claremont ward which would be based on the existing Claremont ward, less the area broadly to the west of Lancaster Road and north of Orient Road, together with the area surrounding Greenbank Road and Southgarth Road from the existing Weaste & Seedley ward. It was argued that this proposed ward recognised the presence of the M602 motorway, acknowledged the 'focus' of Monton Village and took into account future development within the area. The remaining part of the existing Claremont ward would be combined with part of the existing Eccles ward, the area broadly to the east of Cavendish Road, as detailed above, and part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area broadly to the west of and including Hope Hospital and west of Daniel Adamson Road, to form a new Ellesmere ward. It was argued that the areas to be combined in this ward were 'stable residential areas (with a varied mix of private and public property type)'. The remaining part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward would be combined with part of the existing Langworthy ward, the area west of Fitzwarren Street and south of Liverpool Street, and part of the existing Ordsall ward, the area broadly bounded by Trafford Road and Broadway to form a revised Weaste & Seedley ward. It was argued that the areas to be combined were similar and it was hoped that the revised ward would 'encourage comprehensive integrated planning of services and redevelopment with the respective communities involved'. It was also argued that the revised ward recognises the separation and difference in character of the area broadly to the north of Broadway and west of Trafford Road with the areas to the south (the Quays). The remaining part of the existing Langworthy ward would form part of a new Pendleton with Blackfriars ward, as detailed below.

102 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, Ellesmere, New Claremont and Weaste & Seedley wards would contain 3% fewer, 6% more and 13% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1% fewer, 4% more and 2% more by 2006).

103 The Liberal Democrats proposed a revised Claremont ward which would be based on the existing ward, less the area broadly bounded by Claremont Road and Moorfield Road. They proposed a revised Weaste & Seedley ward which would comprise the existing ward, less the area surrounding Greenbank Road and Southgarth Road, together with the area to the west of Langworthy Road from the existing Langworthy ward. The remaining part of the existing Langworthy ward would be divided between new Pendleton West and Pendleton East wards while the remaining parts of the existing Weaste & Seedley and Claremont wards would form part of a new Pendleton West ward, both of which are detailed below.

104 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals, Claremont and Weaste & Seedley wards would contain 5% fewer and 11% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (7% fewer and 1% more by 2006).

105 Home Watch commented on the Hope area, which currently forms part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward. It stated that the areas to the north of Eccles Old Road (to the west of Lancaster Road and Stott Lane) share a 'community centre' at their common boundary of Eccles Old Road. It also asserted that this area shares links with parts of the neighbouring Eccles ward and suggested some possible re-warding to the existing Claremont and Weaste & Seedley wards which were based on these links and broadly similar to those proposals put forward by Hope Action Group.

106 Home Watch objected to the City Council's proposed Claremont ward, stating that the areas to be included from the existing Swinton South ward, to the north of the East Lancashire

Road are regarded as having their community links within Swinton and that the East Lancashire Road forms a 'natural barrier'. They also referred to the Duchy Estate, asserting the view that this area would be better represented in a ward with the areas to its south-west (the other side of the A6) with which it is argued it has 'strong community links'.

107 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which we consider provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria, while facilitating our proposals across the city as a whole. We note that there was limited consensus on the most appropriate re-warding of this part of the city and we therefore based our conclusions on strength of boundaries, electoral equality and on the level of evidence and argumentation received in support of the alternative proposals. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we have identified the A6 (Broad Street) as a significant boundary. This was only respected under the City Council's proposals and breached under the alternative city-wide schemes. We were not persuaded by the Liberal Democrats' proposals, particularly in relation to their proposed boundary between Pendleton West and Weaste & Seedley wards. Furthermore, we have also identified Langworthy Road as a focus as opposed to a divide of communities with the areas either side being similar in character. In addition to this, the Liberal Democrats' proposals were weakened as a whole by the fact that they were not supported by any evidence and argumentation and derived from the desire to retain the existing parliamentary constituency boundary.

108 We are of the view that the Conservatives' proposals to the north and south of this area are not an adequate reflection of community identity and consequently weaken the scheme in this area as a whole. Their proposed Kersal ward covers a large geographical area, containing disparate communities and breaching significant barriers such as the A6 (Broad Street) and, even more significantly in our view, the River Irwell. In the south, their proposed Salford Quays ward again covers a large geographical area, uniting areas which are geographically separated.

109 Finally, we considered carefully the alternative proposals put forward by Hope Action Group and Home Watch, which were broadly similar. While we consider that elements of these proposals have merit, we were not persuaded that they provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we are not of the view that the Hope area has strong links with the Eccles area to its west, nor are we persuaded that the communities in this area would be adversely affected if the City Council's proposals were to be adopted. We were also not persuaded by the level of evidence and argumentation provided in support of these proposals, nor did we consider that sufficient thought had been given to the consequent effect of the proposals in this area on the scheme across the city as a whole.

110 On balance, and taking into account our proposals elsewhere in the city, we conclude that the City Council's proposals provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We do, however, propose an amendment to the eastern boundary of the proposed Langworthy ward in order to provide for a more clearly identifiable boundary. This amendment would be based on the proposal submitted by Hope Action Group and results in the use of Albion Way as a boundary, uniting the area surrounding Trenam Place with the area to its west from which its main access is served.

111 Under our draft recommendations, Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards would contain 3% more, 19% more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% more, 6% more and 5% fewer by 2006).

## Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton wards

112 The existing wards of Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton are situated in the east of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton wards contain 29%, 38% and 19% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (6%, 34% and 26% fewer by 2006).

113 At Stage One, the City Council proposed a significant amount of change in this area. It proposed a new Trinity & Crescent ward which would comprise part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area to the north of Broad Street, part the existing Claremont ward (the Duchy Estate), part of the existing Pendlebury ward, a small area of housing off Langley Road, as detailed above, and part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area broadly to the south of the River Irwell and north of Chapel Street and Trinity Way. The Council stated that the proposed ward retains many of the existing communities that existed under previous boundary reviews. It also sought to unite buildings affiliated with Salford University within the same city ward. The remaining part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area to the south of Broad Street would form part of a revised Langworthy ward, as detailed above. Part of the remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area broadly to the south of Chapel Street and Trinity Way, would be combined with the existing Ordsall ward to form a revised Ordsall ward, which the Council stated is a ward that contains strong community identities. The remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area broadly to the north of the River Irwell, would form part of a revised Broughton ward, as detailed below.

114 Under the City Council's proposals, Ordsall and Trinity & Crescent wards would contain 29% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (5% and 4% fewer by 2006).

115 The Conservatives proposed a new Salford Quays ward which would comprise the whole of the existing Ordsall ward, part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, as detailed above, and part of the existing Blackfriars ward, broadly to the south of New Bailey Street, Chapel Street and Cockgroft Road. The Conservatives argued that bringing together the new development at the Quays and the older areas of Weaste and Ordsall 'could well have a beneficial effect on the future regeneration of the area'. Part of the remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward would form part of a new Langworthy & Seedley ward, as detailed above, while the remainder of the ward would form part of a revised Blackfriars ward which would also incorporate part of the existing Broughton ward, broadly to the south of Great Cheetham Street West and part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area surrounding Seaford Road (bounded by the River Irwell). The Conservatives stated that this area is due to undertake a significant amount of regeneration and that 'this new ward will give the opportunity to build on these changes and to establish a strong and active local community'. Part of the remaining part of the existing Pendleton ward would form part of a new Langworthy & Seedley ward, as detailed above, while the remainder of the ward would be combined with the majority of the existing Kersal ward, the area broadly to the west of Bury New Road and Park Lane, to form a revised Kersal ward. The Conservatives stated that 'the local communities will remain largely unaffected by the proposed changes'.

116 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Blackfriars, Kersal and Salford Quays wards would contain 12%, 1% and 13% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (1% more, equal to the average and 1% fewer by 2006).

117 As detailed above, under Hope Action Group's proposals, part of the existing Ordsall ward would form part of a revised Weaste & Seedley ward. The remaining part of the existing Ordsall ward would be combined with part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area broadly bounded by Albion Way, the railway line, the A6, Trinity Way and Brotherton Drive, to form a new Waterside (or City South) ward. Part of the remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area to the west of Albion Way and south of the River Irwell, would be combined with the

whole of the existing Pendleton ward and the remaining part of the existing Langworthy ward to form a new Pendleton with Blackfriars ward. Finally, the remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area to the north of the River Irwell, would form part of a revised Broughton ward, as detailed below.

118 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, Pendleton with Blackfriars and Waterside (or City South) wards would contain 8% more and 20% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3% and 5% more by 2006).

119 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new Pendleton West ward which would comprise part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area broadly to the south-west of the railway line, together with the area broadly bounded by Claremont Road and Moorfield Road from the existing Claremont ward, the area surrounding Greenbank Road and Southgarth Road from the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, as detailed above, together with part of the existing Langworthy ward, the area to the east of Langworthy Road (less the area bounded by Liverpool Street and Athole Street). The remaining part of the existing Pendleton ward, the area broadly to the north-east of the railway line would be combined with the remaining part of the existing Langworthy ward (the area bounded by Liverpool Street and Athole Street) and part of the existing Blackfriars ward, the area broadly between the railway line, Oldfield Road and Brotherton Drive and Lower Broughton Road, Cottenham Lane and Sherborne Street West to form a new Pendleton East ward. Finally, the Liberal Democrats proposed a new Quays ward which would comprise the existing Ordsall ward, together with the area broadly to the south of Brotherton Drive and east of Oldfield Road from the existing Blackfriars ward. The remaining part of the existing Blackfriars ward would form part of a revised Broughton ward, as detailed below.

120 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals, Pendleton East, Pendleton West and Quays wards would contain 10% fewer, 4% more and 28% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (5%, 4% and 9% fewer by 2006).

121 Home Watch expressed support for Hope Action Group's proposed Pendleton with Blackfriars ward, and expressed opposition to the City Council's proposal to remove the existing Blackfriars ward, stating that it believed this 'to be short sighted due to the resurgence of residential development in the area because of the close proximity of Manchester city centre and the Castlefields area'.

122 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals. This is largely owing to our conclusions in the area to the west and the need to respect significant boundaries such as the River Irwell and Trinity Way. We note that the proposals in relation to the proposed Ordsall ward are broadly similar under the City Council's, the Liberal Democrats and Hope Action Group's proposals. Officers from the Committee having visited the area concluded that the areas either side of Trafford Road are similar in character and should form part of the same city ward. We conclude that, on balance, the City Council's proposed Ordsall ward provides for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We do, however, propose a minor amendment to the western boundary of the proposed Ordsall ward resulting in the use of Albion Way as a boundary, as detailed above.

123 As detailed above, we were not persuaded by the Conservatives' proposals in this area in relation to the breaching of the River Irwell. There is consensus within the other city-wide schemes that this boundary be respected and we concur with this view. We were also unable to facilitate the proposals made by Hope Action Group, Home Watch and the Liberal Democrats owing to our proposals elsewhere in the city. We do, however, propose an amendment to the southern boundary of the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward in order to provide for a more clearly identifiable boundary. As detailed above, we conclude that the River Irwell is a strong boundary in this area. We therefore propose transferring the area surrounding Elton Street from

the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward to the proposed Broughton ward in order for the River Irwell to be utilised as a boundary. We did consider making an amendment to the northwestern boundary of the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we consider that there would be merit in the Duchy Estate forming part of the proposed Pendlebury or Claremont wards with which it has closer communication links. However, this area contains over 1,000 electors and transferring it from the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward would result in this ward being significantly over-represented by 2006. In addition, Duchy Road links the Duchy Estate to the rest of the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward and we do not consider that the identities and interests of this community would be significantly adversely affected under our draft recommendations. We do, however, welcome further views on this issue at Stage Three.

124 Under our draft recommendations, Ordsall and Trinity & Crescent wards would contain 32% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (8% and 7% fewer by 2006).

## Broughton and Kersal wards

125 The existing wards of Broughton and Kersal are situated in the extreme north-east of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under existing arrangements, Broughton ward contains 29% fewer electors per councillor than the city average (34% fewer by 2006) and Kersal ward contains 6% more electors per councillor than the city average (9% more by 2006).

126 At Stage One, the City Council proposed broadly retaining the existing wards in this area. It proposed a revised Broughton ward which would comprise the existing ward, together with the area broadly to the north of the River Irwell from the existing Blackfriars ward, as detailed above, and the area surrounding Lower Broughton Road from the existing Kersal ward. The Council stated that 'the review has provided an opportunity to bring together into the same ward the large communities of Higher and Lower Broughton'. In addition, it stated that the inclusion of the Lower Broughton Road area was thought appropriate as this area has 'closer links with Higher Broughton than with Kersal'. The remaining part of the existing Kersal ward would form a revised Kersal ward which the Council stated 'retains the three distinct communities which exist within this ward'.

127 Under the City Council's proposals, Broughton and Kersal wards would contain 6% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (equal to the average and 2% more by 2006).

128 As detailed above, the Conservatives proposed a revised Kersal ward, encompassing the majority of the existing Kersal ward and part of the existing Pendleton ward. The remaining part of the existing Kersal ward, the area broadly to the east of Bury New Road and Park Lane, would be combined with part of the existing Broughton ward, the area broadly to the north of Great Cheetham Street West, to form a revised Broughton ward. The Conservatives argued that 'there are strong religious and community ties, which we feel, will be enhanced by the new areas, which are already part of the same community'. Finally, the remaining part of the existing Broughton ward would form part of a revised Blackfriars ward, as detailed above.

129 Under the Conservatives' proposals, Broughton ward would contain 7% more electors per councillor than the city average (2% more by 2006).

130 Hope Action Group's proposals in this area were broadly similar to those put forward by the City Council, being identical in relation to the revised Kersal ward. It proposed a revised Broughton ward which would comprise the existing ward, together with part of the existing Blackfriars ward, broadly to the north of the River Irwell, as detailed above, together with the Lower Broughton area from the existing Kersal ward.

131 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, Broughton and Kersal wards would contain 6% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (equal to the average and 2% more by 2006).

132 The Liberal Democrats proposed broadly retaining the existing Kersal ward, subject to the transfer of the areas surrounding Lower Broughton and broadly to the east of Leicester Road into the revised Broughton ward. The revised Broughton ward would comprise the existing ward, together with the two areas from the existing Kersal ward, as detailed above and the area broadly to the north of Lower Broughton Road, Cottenham Lane and Sherborne Street West from the existing Blackfriars ward.

133 Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals, Broughton and Kersal wards would contain 5% more and 9% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (equal to the average and 6% fewer by 2006).

134 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we propose basing our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which were broadly similar to those put forward by the Liberal Democrats, Hope Action Group and Home Watch. As already discussed, we identified the River Irwell as a significant boundary in this area and concluded that this should be respected within our draft recommendations. Both the Conservatives' and the Liberal Democrats' proposals breach the river and we are therefore not persuaded that they should be adopted. We note that the proposals submitted by the City Council and Hope Action Group are identical in relation to the proposed Kersal ward and broadly identical in relation to the proposed Broughton ward. We therefore propose basing our draft recommendations on the City Council's proposals subject to an amendment to the southern boundary of the proposed Broughton ward, in order to utilise the River Irwell as proposed by Hope Action Group, as detailed above.

135 Under our draft recommendations, Broughton and Kersal wards would contain 6% more and 1% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (3% and 2% more by 2006).

## Electoral cycle

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

## Conclusions

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

- a council of 60 members should be retained;
- there should be 20 wards;
- the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified and one ward should retain its existing boundaries.

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

- we propose an amendment between the proposed Cadishead and Irlam wards in order to provide for an improved level of electoral equality;
- we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Irlam and Barton wards in order to provide for a better reflection of community identity;

- we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Swinton South and Worsley wards in order to utilise the whole of Folly Brook as a boundary;
- we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Langworthy and Ordsall wards in order to utilise Albion Way as a boundary;
- we propose amending the boundary between the proposed Trinity & Crescent and Broughton wards in order to utilise the River Irwell as a boundary;
- we propose adopting the Conservatives' proposed ward name of Boothstown & Ellenbrook.

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

*Table 5: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements*

	2001 Electorate		2006 Electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	60	60	60	60
Number of wards	20	20	20	20
Average number of electors per councillor	2,679	2,679	2,695	2,695
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	15	4	14	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	9	1	8	0

140 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Salford City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 15 to four. By 2006 only one ward, Cadishead, is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

***Draft recommendation***

Salford City Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

*Map 2: Draft recommendations for Salford*



## 5 What happens next?

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

142 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

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



# Appendix A

## Draft recommendations for Salford: **Detailed mapping**

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

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

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

*Map A1: Draft recommendations for Salford: Key map*

# Appendix B

## Code of practice on written consultation

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

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

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

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