

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Pendle in Lancashire

*February 2000*

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

Professor Malcolm Grant (Chairman)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE (Deputy Chairman)  
Kru Desai  
Peter Brokenshire  
Pamela Gordon  
Robin Gray  
Robert Hughes CBE

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective 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, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the borough.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Pendle in Lancashire.

© Crown Copyright 2000

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 Local Government Commission for England 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
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Pendle: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>
B Pendle Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>33</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>35</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Nelson and Colne is inserted inside the back cover of the report



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Pendle on 7 September 1999.

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

We found that the existing electoral arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in Pendle.

- **In 10 of the 19 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and two wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average.**
- **By 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in seven wards and by more than 20 per cent in three wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs (73-74) are that:

- **Pendle Borough Council should have 49 councillors, two fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 20 wards, instead of 19 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

These draft recommendations seek to ensure that the number of electors represented by each borough councillor is as nearly as possible the same, having regard to local circumstances.

- **In 18 of the proposed 20 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to continue with the number of electors per councillor in all 20 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the district in 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Barrowford parish;**
- **revised warding arrangements for Brierfield Town Council.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 15 February 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. 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 and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 10 April 2000:

**Review Manager  
Pendle Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142  
E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
1	Barrowford	3	Barrowford ward (part – Carr Hall ward, Central ward, Newbridge ward and Higherford ward (part) of Barrowford parish)	Large map and Map A2
2	Blacko & Higherford	1	Barrowford ward (part – Higherford ward (part) of Barrowford parish); Pendleside ward (part – Blacko parish)	Maps 2 and A2
3	Boulsworth	3	Boulsworth ward (part – Laneshaw Bridge parish, Trawden ward and Winewall & Cottontree ward of Trawden Forest parish; and unparished area)	Maps 2 and A3
4	Bradley (in Nelson)	3	Bradley ward; Whitefield ward (part); Marsden ward (part)	Large map
5	Brierfield	3	Brierfield ward (part – East ward (part) and West ward of Brierfield Town Council); Clover Hill ward (part)	Large map
6	Clover Hill (in Nelson)	3	Clover Hill ward (part); Southfield ward (part); Walverden ward (part)	Large map
7	Coates	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Coates ward of Barnoldswick Town Council)	Map 2
8	Craven	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Bracewell & Brogden parish; Craven ward of Barnoldswick Town Council)	Map 2
9	Earby	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Kelbrook & Sough, Salterforth and Earby parishes)	Map 2
10	Foulridge	1	Foulridge ward (Foulridge parish); Horsfield ward (part)	Maps 2 and A3
11	Higham & Pendleside	1	Fence ward (part – Higham-With-West Close Booth parish); Pendleside ward (part – Barley-With-Wheatley Booth, Goldshaw Booth and Roughlee Booth parishes)	Maps 2 and A2
12	Horsfield (in Colne)	3	Boulsworth ward (part); Horsfield ward (part); Vivary Bridge ward (part)	Maps 2 and A3
13	Marsden (in Nelson)	2	Marsden ward (part)	Large map and Map 2
14	Old Laund Booth	1	Fence ward (part – Old Laund Booth parish)	Large map and Map 2
15	Reedley	3	Brierfield ward (part – South ward and East ward (part) of Brierfield Town Council); Reedley ward	Large map and Map 2
16	Southfield (in Nelson)	3	Marsden ward (part); Southfield ward (part)	Large map

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Map reference</b>
17	Vivary Bridge (in Colne)	3	Vivary Bridge ward (part); Waterside ward (part)	Maps 2 and A4
18	Walverden (in Nelson)	2	Walverden ward (part); Whitefield ward (part)	Large map
19	Waterside (in Colne)	3	Boulsworth ward (part); Marsden ward (part); Waterside ward (part); Vivary Bridge ward (part)	Large map and Maps 2 and A4
20	Whitefield (in Nelson)	2	Walverden ward (part); Whitefield ward (part)	Large map

*Notes: 1 Nelson and part of Colne are the only unparished parts of the borough and comprises the nine wards indicated above.*

*2 Map 2, Appendix A and the large map in the back of the report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.*

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Pendle

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barrowford	3	3,955	1,318	2	4,008	1,336	-1
2	Blacko & Higherford	1	1,336	1,336	3	1,382	1,382	3
3	Boulsworth	3	3,752	1,251	-3	3,948	1,316	-2
4	Bradley (in Nelson)	3	4,287	1,429	10	4,280	1,427	6
5	Brierfield	3	3,504	1,168	-10	3,952	1,317	-2
6	Clover Hill (in Nelson)	3	3,885	1,295	0	3,973	1,324	-2
7	Coates	3	3,899	1,300	0	4,170	1,390	3
8	Craven	3	4,053	1,351	4	4,131	1,377	2
9	Earby	3	4,316	1,439	11	4,385	1,462	9
10	Foulridge	1	1,321	1,321	2	1,336	1,336	-1
11	Higham & Pendleside	1	1,370	1,370	6	1,414	1,414	5
12	Horsfield (in Colne)	3	3,815	1,272	-2	3,813	1,271	-6
13	Marsden (in Nelson)	2	2,657	1,329	3	2,729	1,365	1
14	Old Laund Booth	1	1,239	1,239	-4	1,239	1,239	-8
15	Reedley	3	3,770	1,257	-3	3,991	1,330	-1
16	Southfield (in Nelson)	3	3,616	1,205	-7	3,930	1,310	-3
17	Vivary Bridge (in Colne)	3	4,031	1,344	4	4,062	1,354	1
18	Walverden (in Nelson)	2	2,485	1,243	-4	2,548	1,274	-5
19	Waterside (in Colne)	3	3,400	1,133	-12	3,863	1,288	-4
20	Whitefield (in Nelson)	2	2,759	1,380	7	2,773	1,387	3
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>63,450</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,927</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,295</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,345</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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



# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Pendle in Lancashire on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 12 districts in Lancashire (excluding Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool) as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. We expect to review the unitary authorities of Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool in 2001. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Pendle. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in July 1975 (Report No. 20). The electoral arrangements of Lancashire County Council were last reviewed in November 1980 (Report No. 399). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements shortly after completion of the district reviews in order to enable orders to be made by the Secretary of State in time for the 2005 county elections.

3 In undertaking these reviews, we must have regard to:

- the statutory criteria in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992, ie the need to:
  - (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
  - (b) secure effective and convenient local government;
- the *Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements* in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 (see Appendix C).

4 We are required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State on the number of councillors who should serve on the Borough Council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also make recommendations on the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the borough.

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (third edition published in October 1999). This sets out our approach to the reviews.

6 In our *Guidance*, we state that we wish wherever possible to build on schemes which have been prepared locally on the basis of careful and effective consultation. Local interests are normally in a better position to judge what council size and ward configuration are most likely to secure effective and convenient local government in their areas, while allowing proper reflection of the identities and interests of local communities.

7 Second, the broad objective of PERs is then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the borough as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any

ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 Third, we are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that borough but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. 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 a Borough’s electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

*Figure 3: Stages of the Review*

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

10 In July 1998 the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the borough and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the borough council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 PER programme, including the Lancashire Boroughs, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the March 1998 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

12 Stage One began on 7 September 1999, when we wrote to Pendle Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Lancashire County Council,

Lancashire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Lancashire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the Borough, the Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough and the 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 the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 29 November 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 15 February 1999 and will end on 10 April 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations 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 our draft recommendations.**

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.



## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 The borough of Pendle is situated in the east of Lancashire, adjoining the counties of North Yorkshire and West Yorkshire and comprises an area of approximately 17,000 hectares. The main centres of population are Nelson, Colne, Barnoldswick, Barrowford, Brierfield, Earby and Trawden. Much of the area is rural and includes some of the most beautiful countryside in Britain. The M65 motorway links Nelson and Colne with Blackburn, and will shortly be extended westwards to the M61 and M6 motorways.

17 The borough contains 17 parish and town councils, but Nelson and Colne are unparished. The towns of Nelson and Colne comprise approximately 50 per cent of the borough's total electorate.

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 borough average in percentage terms. In the text which follows this calculation may also be described using the shorthand term 'electoral variance'.

19 The electorate of the borough is 63,450 (February 1999). The Council at present has 51 members who are elected from 19 wards, nine of which cover the urban areas of Nelson and Colne and the remainder being predominantly rural. Sixteen of the wards are each represented by three councillors and three are single-member wards. The Council is elected by thirds.

20 Since the last electoral review there has been a decline in the total electorate of Pendle borough, with around 3 per cent fewer electors than two decades ago. The most notable increases have been in Barrowford, Fence and Reedley wards as a result of housing developments.

21 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,244 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,293 by the year 2004 if the current number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 10 of the 19 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average and two wards have variances in excess of 20 per cent from the average. The worst imbalance is in Fence ward where the councillor represents 53 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Pendle*

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Barrowford	3	4,789	1,596	28	4,883	1,628	26
2	Boulsworth	3	4,275	1,425	15	4,467	1,489	15
3	Bradley (in Nelson)	3	3,632	1,211	-3	3,627	1,209	-6
4	Brierfield	3	3,255	1,085	-13	3,716	1,239	-4
5	Clover Hill (in Nelson)	3	3,485	1,162	-7	3,573	1,191	-8
6	Coates	3	3,899	1,300	4	4,170	1,390	8
7	Craven	3	4,053	1,351	9	4,131	1,377	7
8	Earby	3	4,316	1,439	16	4,385	1,462	13
9	Fence	1	1,908	1,908	53	1,905	1,905	47
10	Foulridge	1	1,147	1,147	-8	1,162	1,162	-10
11	Horsfield (in Colne)	3	3,413	1,138	-9	3,415	1,138	-12
12	Marsden (in Nelson)	3	3,610	1,203	-3	3,684	1,228	-5
13	Pendleside	1	1,203	1,203	-3	1,255	1,255	-3
14	Reedley	3	3,659	1,220	-2	3,867	1,289	0
15	Southfield (in Nelson)	3	3,250	1,083	-13	3,562	1,187	-8
16	Vivary Bridge (in Colne)	3	4,219	1,406	13	4,250	1,417	10
17	Walverden (in Nelson)	3	2,981	994	-20	3,046	1,015	-21
18	Waterside (in Colne)	3	3,234	1,078	-13	3,697	1,232	-5
19	Whitefield (in Nelson)	3	3,122	1,041	-16	3,132	1,044	-19
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>63,450</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>65,927</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,244</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,293</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Pendle Borough Council

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Walverden ward were relatively over-represented by 20 per cent, while electors in Fence ward were relatively under-represented by 53 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

22 At the start of the review we invited members of the public and other interested parties to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Pendle Borough Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

23 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received five representations during Stage One, including a borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

#### **Pendle Borough Council**

24 The Borough Council proposed a council of 49 members, two fewer than at present, serving 20 wards, one more than at present. It proposed 13 three-member wards, three two-member wards and four single-member wards. Under the Borough Council's proposals, four wards would remain unchanged.

25 The Borough Council's scheme would provide much improved electoral equality for the borough as a whole, resulting in the number of electors per councillor varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average in 18 of the proposed 20 wards. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve further, resulting in all wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average by 2004. The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

#### **Parish and Town Councils**

26 We received representations from one parish council and one town council. Blacko Parish Council requested that Blacko remain in the same ward as the neighbouring Pendleside villages. Brierfield Town Council wrote in support of the existing electoral arrangements for Pendle Borough Council and saw no need for change.

#### **Other Representations**

27 We received a further two representations. North West Conservatives wrote on behalf of local Conservative councillors and the Pendle Conservative Association, fully supporting the Borough Council's proposals. A local resident argued that there should be a significant decrease in the number of councillors for the borough, with a move towards a pattern of single-member wards. However, she did not put forward any detailed proposals.



## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

28 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Pendle is to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to the statutory criteria set out in the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which 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 assumptions as to changes in the number and distribution of local government electors likely to take place within the ensuing five years. We must have regard to the desirability of fixing identifiable boundaries and to maintaining local ties which might otherwise be broken.

30 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for 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 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective 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 start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

### **Electorate Forecasts**

32 The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4 per cent from 63,450 to 65,927 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Brierfield and Waterside wards, although a significant amount is also expected in Southfield ward. The Council has 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 Borough Council on the likely effect on electorate of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

33 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

## **Council Size**

34 As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

35 Pendle Borough Council at present has 51 members. The Borough Council proposed a council of 49 members arguing that there was “no compelling reason for increasing or reducing the number of councillors in the light of likely changes to the political structure”. It therefore constructed its proposals on the assumption that the existing number of councillors secured effective and convenient local government. However, it proposed a decrease of two to 49 members in order to develop a “detailed, rational and sensible” scheme which would achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality.

36 North West Conservatives supported the Borough Council’s proposals, while a local resident proposed a significant decrease in council size. The local resident did not, however, specify an alternative council size, or make detailed proposals.

37 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 49 members.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

38 In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council’s proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have concluded that we should base our recommendations on the Borough Council’s scheme. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Borough Council’s proposals in six areas. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Barrowford, Fence and Pendleside wards;
- (b) Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield wards;
- (c) Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield wards;
- (d) Brierfield and Reedley wards;
- (e) Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge wards;
- (f) Boulsworth, Horsfield, Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards.

39 Details of our draft recommendations are set out in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

### **Barrowford, Fence and Pendleside wards**

40 The existing wards of Barrowford, Fence and Pendleside are situated in the south-west corner of the borough. Barrowford ward covers Barrowford parish, Fence ward comprises the parishes

of Higham-With-West Close Booth and Old Laund Booth and Pendleside ward comprises the parishes of Barley-With-Wheatley Booth, Blacko, Goldshaw Booth and Roughlee Booth. Fence and Pendleside wards are each represented by a single councillor while Barrowford ward is represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements for a council size of 51, Barrowford and Fence wards contain 28 and 53 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. The current Pendleside ward contains 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years.

41 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed combining Blacko parish, from the existing Pendleside ward, with part of Higherford ward of Barrowford parish from the existing Barrowford ward, to create a new single-member Blacko & Higherford ward. Barrowford ward would remain unchanged with the exception of the Higherford area to the north and east of Colne Road and Ford Street which would form part of the new Blacko & Higherford ward. It proposed that part of the existing Fence ward, Higham-With-West Close Booth Parish, be combined with the remainder of Pendleside ward, (the parishes of Goldshaw Booth, Barley-With-Wheatley Booth and Roughlee Booth) to form a new single-member Higham & Pendleside ward. The remainder of the existing Fence ward, Old Laund Booth parish, would form a new single-member Old Laund Booth ward.

42 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Blacko & Higherford, Barrowford, Higham & Pendleside and Old Laund Booth wards would vary from the borough average by 3 per cent, 2 per cent, 6 per cent and 4 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years with the exception of Old Laund Booth ward, where electoral equality is projected to deteriorate so that it has a variance of 8 per cent from the borough average by 2004.

43 We received two further submissions in relation to this area. The North West Conservatives fully supported the Borough Council's proposals. Blacko Parish Council opposed the Borough Council's proposals, arguing that Blacko should remain part of Pendleside ward with its neighbouring villages.

44 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals would provide for improved levels of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and are content to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations. While we note the comments made by Blacko Parish Council, we are content that the Borough Council's proposals would reasonably reflect communities in the area, and would address the high levels of electoral inequality which currently exist. We recognise that in order to address the significant levels of under-representation in Barrowford ward, the council has divided Barrowford parish between wards. We recognise this represents a significant change and would particularly welcome the views of residents and interested parties on this proposal at Stage Three. The proposed boundary between Barrowford and Blacko & Higherford wards is illustrated on Map A2 at Appendix A.

### **Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield wards**

45 The existing wards of Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield are situated in the south of the borough, and form part of the unparished town of Nelson. All three wards are currently

represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements, Walverden and Whitefield wards have relatively poor electoral equality with 20 per cent and 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Bradley ward contains 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. This level of electoral equality is predicted to marginally deteriorate by 2004.

46 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed largely retaining these wards, subject to some boundary modifications. It proposed modifying the existing Whitefield ward by altering the boundary with Bradley ward to follow Pendle Street and the M65 to where it meets Pendle Water. In order to improve the electoral equality of Bradley ward further, it proposed that part of the existing Marsden ward be combined with the remainder of the existing Bradley ward, with the boundary continuing along the railway line to Walton Lane and then rejoining Leeds Road. The Borough Council argued that these areas share common social conditions which make them suitable areas to transfer. It also proposed that the boundary between Walverden and Whitefield wards be modified so that it continues along the centre of Manchester Road to the junction with Broadway, then along Broadway/Hibson Street to Sugar Street and the intersection of the railway line, arguing that this would provide a more easily identifiable boundary. The remaining substantial portion of Walverden ward would be combined with part of the existing Whitefield ward to form a revised two-member Walverden ward.

47 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed three-member Bradley, and two-member Walverden and Whitefield wards would vary by 9 per cent, 1 per cent and 5 per cent from the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve slightly over the next five years to 5 per cent, 2 per cent and 2 per cent from the borough average by 2004. We received one other submission in relation to this area from the North West Conservatives who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

48 We have considered the Borough Council's proposals for this area and conclude that they provide a reasonable level of electoral equality and satisfactorily meet the statutory criteria. However, as part of our draft recommendations, we propose making minor modifications to the Borough Council's proposals which we consider would better reflect community identity and provide for more easily identifiable boundaries. We propose that the boundary between the revised Walverden and Whitefield wards should follow the railway line to the rear of the properties on Manchester Road to its junction with Lomeshaye Road. This change would transfer 76 electors to Whitefield ward and would utilise the Preston to Colne railway line as a boundary. We also propose that the boundary between the proposed Bradley and Whitefield wards should be modified in order that the area north of Barrowford Road surrounding Nelson & Colne College of Further Education and south of Barrowford Road, namely Gill Street and Surrey Road, be transferred to Bradley ward. This would better reflect the identities and interests of a small number of electors (42) who have good communication links with the rest of Bradley ward.

49 Under our draft recommendations, the revised Bradley and Whitefield wards would have 10 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (and 6 per cent and 3 per cent more in 2004). Walverden ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (5 per cent fewer in 2004).

## **Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield wards**

50 The existing wards of Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield are situated in the south of the borough and cover part of the unparished town of Nelson. All three wards are currently represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements, Clover Hill and Marsden wards have relatively good levels of electoral equality, containing 7 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Southfield ward contains 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than borough average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain fairly constant over the next five years.

51 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed combining part of the existing Marsden ward with Bradley ward, as detailed above. It proposed that part of Marsden ward should be combined with the majority of the existing Southfield ward to the west of Marsden Hall Road, together with the Linkside Avenue area, to form a revised three-member Southfield ward. It also proposed a small boundary modification between Marsden and Waterside wards. The remainder of the existing Marsden ward would form a revised two-member Marsden ward. Part of the existing Southfield ward around Southfield Street would be combined with the majority of the existing Clover Hill ward, arguing that this area has more affinity with Clover Hill ward. In order to justify three councillors for the proposed Clover Hill ward, the Council also proposed a minor boundary modification with Walverden ward.

52 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the proposed Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield wards would have equal to, 3 per cent more and 7 per cent fewer electors than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is predicted to remain fairly constant over the next five years. We received one other submission in relation to this area, from the North West Conservatives, who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

53 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals for this area provide a reasonable level of electoral equality and address the imbalances that currently exist in these wards. We are therefore content to substantially endorse the Borough Council's proposals for this area. We do, however, propose two amendments to its proposals. We note that, under the Borough Council's proposals, Deerstone Road, Marsden Hall Road and Town House Road would be divided between the two wards of Marsden and Southfield. We propose that the area bounded by Town House Road and Linkside Avenue, containing 226 electors, should remain in Marsden ward rather than being transferred to Southfield ward. Instead, we propose that the boundary between the two wards should continue along Hallam Road to Hazelwood Road, then south down the middle of Hazelwood Road to Bakerhouse Road. We consider that this would result in a more easily identifiable boundary, would reduce the number of roads divided between wards and would unite similar areas. We consider that the Borough Council's proposal for a minor modification to the boundary between Marsden and Waterside wards provides for good communication links for an area which, under existing arrangements, is geographically isolated from the rest of Marsden ward. We consider that this argument can be extended further to include Height Side Bungalows and Hubbs Tenement (6 electors). We believe that these electors would be better represented within a revised Waterside ward and propose amending the boundary accordingly.

54 Under our draft recommendations, the revised Marsden ward would contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Southfield ward would contain 7 per cent

fewer electors per councillor and Clover Hill ward would have equal to the average. This level of electoral equality is predicted to marginally improve over the next five years, so that Marsden ward would contain 1 per cent more electors than the borough average and Southfield ward would contain 3 per cent fewer electors than the borough average by 2004.

### **Brierfield and Reedley wards**

55 The existing wards of Brierfield and Reedley are situated in the south-west of the borough adjoining Burnley. Brierfield ward is coterminous with East and West wards of Brierfield Town Council, while Reedley ward covers South ward of Brierfield Town Council together with Reedley Hallows parish. Both wards are currently represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements, Reedley ward has 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average, while Brierfield ward has 13 per cent fewer electors than the borough average. Significant growth is projected over the next five years with the result that Brierfield and Reedley wards are projected to have 4 per cent fewer and equal to the average number of electors by 2004 respectively.

56 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed transferring a small part of Clover Hill ward to a revised Brierfield ward. It argued that this would result in better levels of electoral equality and that the proposed boundary along Halifax Road would form a more easily identifiable boundary. The Council proposed that the existing Reedley ward remain unchanged.

57 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Brierfield and Reedley wards would initially vary from the borough average by 7 per cent and 6 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years with variances of 1 per cent and 4 per cent by 2004.

58 We received two further submissions in relation to this area. The North West Conservatives fully supported the Borough Council's proposals. Brierfield Town Council supported the current electoral arrangements and argued that there was no need for change.

59 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals for this area provide a reasonable level of electoral equality while limiting the amount of change by retaining a number of existing boundaries. We note Brierfield Town Council's comments arguing for no change, and recognise that, in electoral equality terms, the Borough Council's proposals are only marginally superior to the existing arrangements. However, we concur with the Borough Council that Halifax Road would form a more identifiable northern boundary for Brierfield ward and are content to put this change forward as part of our draft recommendations. We propose one further change to the boundary between Brierfield and Reedley ward. We propose that the ward boundary should run to the rear of properties on Kings Causeway so that all the properties contained in this area would form part of the same ward. This modification would result in 111 electors being transferred to Reedley ward.

60 Under our draft recommendations, the revised Brierfield and Reedley wards would contain 10 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is predicted to improve over the next five years with Brierfield and Reedley

wards containing 2 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor respectively than the borough average by 2004.

### **Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge wards**

61 The existing wards of Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge are situated in the north of the borough. Coates ward covers the northern part of Barnoldswick, with the remainder of the town, together with Bracewell and Brogden parish meeting, forming Craven Ward. Earby ward contains Earby, Kelbrook & Sough, and Salterforth parishes, while Foulridge ward covers Foulridge parish. Coates, Craven and Earby wards are currently represented by three councillors while Foulridge ward is represented by a single councillor. Under current arrangements, Coates, Craven and Earby wards contain 4 per cent, 9 per cent and 16 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Foulridge ward contains 8 per cent fewer electors than the average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years.

62 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed retaining the existing warding arrangements for Coates, Craven and Earby wards. It argued that these wards provide an acceptable level of electoral equality under a council size of 49, and therefore argued there should be no change. In the case of Earby ward, it argued that due to its composition and geographical location, there was no viable alternative. The Council did, however, propose a minor modification to the existing Foulridge ward. In order to improve electoral equality, the Council proposed that the existing Foulridge ward should be expanded southwards to include the area containing Skipton Road, Castle Road, Manor Road and Noyna View from Horsfield ward.

63 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the proposed Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge wards would have equal to the average, 4 per cent more, 11 per cent more and 2 per cent more electors per councillor respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years, with all wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.

64 We received one other submission in relation to this area from the North West Conservatives who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

65 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals for this area achieve acceptable levels of electoral equality as well as meeting the statutory criteria. We recognise that Earby ward is relatively under-represented, but consider that the ward reflects community identities well, is coterminous with parish boundaries, and note that electoral equality is projected to improve in the ensuing five years. In relation to Foulridge ward, we are content to put forward the Borough Council's proposals. We note that the existing ward, under a revised council size of 49, would have 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004 if it remain unchanged. We feel that this level of electoral inequality should be addressed as part of this review. We therefore propose adopting the Borough Council's proposals for this area as our draft recommendations in their entirety. The proposed boundary between Horsfield and Foulridge wards is illustrated at Appendix A, Map A3.

## **Boulsworth, Horsfield, Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards**

66 The existing Horsfield, Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards cover the town of Colne and are each represented by three councillors. Boulsworth ward also returns three councillors and covers Trawden Forest and Laneshaw Bridge parishes together with part of Colne town. Under current arrangements Boulsworth and Vivary Bridge wards contain 15 per cent and 13 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Horsfield and Waterside wards contain 9 per cent and 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years in Boulsworth, Horsfield and Vivary Bridge wards, while in Waterside ward, electoral equality is forecast to improve to 5 per cent fewer electors than the borough average in 2004.

67 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed transferring part of the existing Boulsworth ward to the west of Skipton Old Road to Horsfield ward, creating a revised three-member Boulsworth ward. It argued that the area to be transferred consists of a housing estate which is more in keeping with the urban area of Colne than the rural area of Boulsworth. The Council also proposed a minor modification to the boundary between Boulsworth and Waterside wards, so that the area between Carry Lane and the Cemetery would form part of a revised three-member Waterside ward. The Council also proposed a minor modification to the existing Vivary Bridge ward, proposing that its boundary with Horsfield ward should in future be New Market Street instead of Windy Bank. The Borough Council also proposed that the northernmost part of the existing Horsfield ward be transferred to Foulridge ward as detailed earlier. In addition, it proposed a minor amendment to the boundary between Waterside and Marsden wards to incorporate a number of properties whose access is from Waterside ward (also detailed earlier).

68 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Boulsworth, Horsfield, Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards would vary from the borough average by 3 per cent, 2 per cent, 4 per cent and 13 per cent respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years with the exception of Waterside ward which is projected to have a variance of 4 per cent from the average by 2004, due to continued growth.

69 We received one other submission in relation to this area from the North West Conservatives who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

70 We consider that the Borough Council's proposals for this area would provide for improved electoral equality while having regard for the identities and interests of the local community. We therefore propose endorsing them as part of our draft recommendations subject to two minor boundary modifications. Firstly, we propose modifying the boundary between Waterside and Vivary Bridge wards so that it follows the A6068 Vivary Way and M65 motorway. This modification would provide for a more clearly identifiable boundary while affecting no electors. Secondly, we propose a further amendment to the boundary between Waterside and Marsden wards to incorporate Hubbs Tenement and Heightside Bungalows in Waterside ward as their access is from this ward (as detailed earlier). The proposed boundary between Horsfield and Waterside wards is illustrated at Map A3, Appendix A, the boundary between Waterside and Vivary Bridge wards is illustrated at Map A4, Appendix A and the proposed boundary between Waterside and Marsden wards is illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

## **Electoral Cycle**

71 We received one representation regarding the Borough Council's electoral cycle. The Borough Council proposed the retention of elections by thirds.

72 We have considered the representation received. At present, there appears to be no demand for change to the present electoral cycle, and we therefore propose no change to the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds for the borough.

## **Conclusions**

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

- (i) there should be a reduction in council size from 51 to 49;
- (ii) there should be 20 wards, one more than at present;
- (iii) the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified;
- (iv) elections should continue to be held by thirds.

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

- (i) we propose modifying the boundary between Brierfield and Reedley wards, in order that the all the properties on Kings Causeway form part of the same ward. This would result in revised warding arrangements for Brierfield Town Council;
- (ii) we propose modifying the boundary between Walverden and Whitefield wards, providing for a more clearly identifiable boundary;
- (iii) we propose modifying the boundary between Bradley and Whitefield wards to better reflect the identities and interests of the local community;
- (iv) we propose modifying the boundary between Marsden and Southfield wards to provide a more clearly identifiable boundary, and a further modification to the boundary between Marsden and Waterside wards to better reflect the interests of the local community;
- (v) we propose modifying the boundary between Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards to provide a more clearly identifiable boundary.

75 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	51	49	51	49
Number of wards	19	20	19	20
Average number of electors per councillor	1,244	1,295	1,293	1,345
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	10	2	7	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	2	0	3	0

76 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Pendle Borough Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the borough average from 10 to two. By 2004, no wards are forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average.

#### **Draft Recommendation**

Pendle Borough Council should comprise 49 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

## **Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements**

77 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different Borough wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the borough. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parish of Barrowford and the town of Brierfield, to reflect the proposed borough wards.

78 The parish of Barrowford is currently served by 12 parish councillors, who represent four wards Carr Hall, Newbridge, Central and Higherford which are each represented by three parish councillors. At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed that part of the existing Higherford parish ward be combined with Blacko parish to form a new Blacko & Higherford borough ward. It proposed that the revised Higherford parish ward be represented by two parish councillors (one fewer than at present) and that the remainder of the current Higherford parish ward be transferred to a revised Central parish ward which should be represented by four parish councillors (one more than at present). It proposed no change to the existing Carr Hall and Newbridge parish wards.

79 As outlined above, we are putting forward the Borough Council’s proposed borough warding arrangements in this area as part of our draft recommendations. We received no other representations on parish warding arrangements for Barrowford parish. Therefore, for the purposes of consultation, we are content to put forward the Borough Council’s proposed changes to warding arrangements in this area.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Barrowford Parish Council should comprise 12 parish councillors, as at present. A revised Higherford parish ward should be represented by two parish councillors, and Central parish ward should be represented by four parish councillors. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed boundary between Blacko & Higherford and Barrowford borough wards. Carr Hall and Newbridge parish wards would remain unchanged. The boundary between the proposed Higherford and Central parish wards is illustrated on Map A2 at Appendix A.

80 Brierfield Town Council is currently represented by 13 town councillors and is divided into three parish wards. East and West parish wards currently form Brierfield borough ward, while South parish ward, together with Reedley Hallows parish, forms Reedley borough ward. East and South wards are currently represented by five parish councillors, while West parish ward is represented by three parish councillors.

81 As part of our draft recommendations, we propose uniting the whole of Kings Causeway in a revised Reedley borough ward in order to better reflect community ties. We therefore propose a consequential change to the boundary between South and East parish wards. At Stage One, Brierfield Town Council proposed no change to its existing parish arrangements.

**Draft Recommendation**  
Brierfield Town Council should comprise 13 parish councillors as at present. The number of parish councillors per ward and the boundaries of West parish ward should remain unchanged. The boundary between East and South parish wards should be modified to reflect the proposed boundary between Brierfield and Reedley borough wards as illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

82 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the borough.

**Draft Recommendation**

For parish and town councils, elections should continue to be held at the same time as elections for the principal authority.

**83 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Pendle and welcome comments from the Borough Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, ward names, and parish and town council electoral arrangements. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.**

*Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Pendle*



## 5 NEXT STEPS

84 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Pendle. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 10 April 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

85 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager  
Pendle Review  
Local Government Commission for England  
Dolphyn Court  
10/11 Great Turnstile  
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: [reviews@lgce.gov.uk](mailto:reviews@lgce.gov.uk)

86 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 Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft Recommendations for Pendle: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Pendle area.

**Map A1** illustrates, in outline form, the proposed ward boundaries within the borough and indicates the areas which are shown in more detail in Maps A2, A3 and A4 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed boundary between Barrowford and Blacko & Higherford wards.

**Map A3** illustrates the proposed boundaries for Horsfield and Waterside wards, and indicates the proposed boundary change with Foulridge ward.

**Map A4** illustrates the proposed boundary between Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards.

The **large map** inserted in the back of the report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for the Nelson area.

*Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Pendle: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed boundary between Barrowford and Blacko & Higherford wards*

*Map A3: Proposed boundaries for Horsfield and Waterside wards*

*Map A4: Proposed boundary between Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards*



## APPENDIX B

### Pendle Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Borough Council only in nine wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

*Figure B1: Pendle Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas*

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1	Bradley (in Nelson)	3	Bradley ward (part); Whitefield ward (part); Marsden ward (part)
2	Brierfield	3	Brierfield ward (East ward and West ward of Brierfield Town Council; Clover Hill ward (part)
3	Marsden (in Nelson)	2	Marsden ward (part)
4	Reedley	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (Reedley Hallows parish and South ward of Brierfield Town Council)
5	Southfield (in Nelson)	3	Southfield ward (part); Marsden ward (part)
6	Vivary Bridge (in Colne)	3	Vivary Bridge ward (part)
7	Walverden (in Nelson)	2	Walverden ward (part); Whitefield ward (part)
8	Waterside (in Colne)	3	Waterside ward; Boulsworth ward (part); Marsden ward (part)
9	Whitefield (in Nelson)	2	Whitefield ward (part); Bradley ward (part)

Figure B2: Pendle Borough Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Bradley (in Nelson)	3	4,245	1,415	9	4,240	1,413	5
2	Brierfield	3	3,615	1,205	-7	4,076	1,359	1
3	Marsden (in Nelson)	2	2,680	1,340	3	2,754	1,377	2
4	Reedley	3	3,659	1,220	-6	3,867	1,289	-4
5	Southfield (in Nelson)	3	3,599	1,200	-7	3,911	1,304	-3
6	Vivary Bridge (in Colne)	3	4,031	1,344	4	4,062	1,354	1
7	Walverden (in Nelson)	2	2,561	1,281	-1	2,626	1,313	-2
8	Waterside (in Colne)	3	3,394	1,131	-13	3,857	1,286	-4
9	Whitefield (in Nelson)	2	2,725	1,363	5	2,735	1,368	2

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

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

## APPENDIX C

### The Statutory Provisions

#### Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to boroughs within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear<sup>1</sup>. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- the name of any electoral area.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- (a) the number of councillors;
- (b) the need for parish wards;
- (c) the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- (d) the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- (e) the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

#### **Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements**

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire boroughs:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the borough likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the borough;
- (b) in a borough every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the borough;
- (c) in a borough every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the borough.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.