

# Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Salford

Report to The Electoral Commission

*August 2003*

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no. 350

# Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	11
2 Current electoral arrangements	13
3 Draft recommendations	17
4 Responses to consultation	19
5 Analysis and final recommendations	21
6 What happens next?	41
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Salford: detailed mapping	43
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	45
C First draft of the electoral change Order for Salford	46



# What is The Boundary Committee for England?

The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of The Electoral Commission, an independent body set up by Parliament under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000. The functions of the Local Government Commission for England were transferred to The Electoral Commission and its Boundary Committee on 1 April 2002 by the Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (SI 2001 No. 3692). The Order also transferred to The Electoral Commission the functions of the Secretary of State in relation to taking decisions on recommendations for changes to local authority electoral arrangements and implementing them.

Members of the Committee are:

Pamela Gordon (Chair)  
Professor Michael Clarke CBE  
Robin Gray  
Joan Jones CBE  
Ann M. Kelly  
Professor Colin Mellors

Archie Gall (Director)

We are required by law to review the electoral arrangements of every principal local authority in England. Our aim is to ensure that the number of electors represented by each councillor in an area is as nearly as possible the same, taking into account local circumstances. We can recommend changes to ward boundaries, the number of councillors and ward names. We can also recommend changes to the electoral arrangements of parish councils.

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the city of Salford in Greater Manchester.



# Summary

We began a review of Salford's electoral arrangements on 8 May 2002. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 25 February 2003, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We now submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

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

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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%;**
- **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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 132 – 133) 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 level of electoral equality is forecast to improve, with the number of electors per councillor in only one ward, Cadishead, expected to vary by more than 10% from the average for the city in 2006.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 8 October 2003. The information in the representations will be available for public access once the Order has been made.

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

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

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	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	Irwell Riverside	3	Part of Blackfriars ward; part of Claremont ward; part of Pendlebury ward; part of Pendleton ward	2
9	Kersal	3	Part of Kersal ward	2
10	Langworthy	3	Part of Blackfriars ward, part of Claremont ward; Langworthy ward; part of Pendleton ward; part of Weaste & Seedley ward	2
11	Little Hulton	3	Little Hulton ward; part of Walkden South ward	1
12	Ordsall	3	Part of Blackfriars ward; part of Ordsall ward; part of Weaste & Seedley ward	2
13	Pendlebury	3	Part of Pendlebury ward; part of Swinton South ward	2
14	Swinton North	3	Part of Swinton North ward	1 and 2
15	Swinton South	3	Part of Pendlebury ward; part of Swinton North ward; part of Swinton South 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
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: Final 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	8,767	2,922	9	8,531	2,844	6
2	Boothstown & Ellenbrook	3	7,595	2,532	-5	7,731	2,577	-4
3	Broughton	3	8,552	2,851	6	8,135	2,712	1
4	Cadishead	3	6,808	2,269	-15	7,165	2,388	-11
5	Claremont	3	8,301	2,767	3	8,225	2,742	2
6	Eccles	3	8,277	2,759	3	8,404	2,801	4
7	Irlam	3	7,135	2,378	-11	7,451	2,484	-8
8	Irwell Riverside	3	7,703	2,568	-4	7,700	2,567	-5
9	Kersal	3	7,952	2,651	-1	8,253	2,751	2
10	Langworthy	3	9,577	3,192	19	8,544	2,848	6
11	Little Hulton	3	8,763	2,921	9	8,330	2,777	3
12	Ordsall	3	5,433	1,811	-32	7,440	2,480	-8
13	Pendlebury	3	8,184	2,728	2	8,162	2,721	1
14	Swinton North	3	8,399	2,800	5	8,490	2,830	5
15	Swinton South	3	8,450	2,817	5	8,464	2,821	5
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	8,086	2,695	1	7,680	2,560	-5
19	Winton	3	8,474	2,825	5	8,325	2,775	3
20	Worsley	3	8,107	2,702	1	8,402	2,801	4
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>160,736</b>	–	–	<b>161,699</b>	–	–
	<b>Averages</b>	–	–	<b>2,679</b>	–	–	<b>2,695</b>	–

Notes:

1. There is a small anomaly between the 2006 electorate totals on Tables 2 and 3. This is due to rounding.
2. 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.



# 1 Introduction

1 This report contains our final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the city of Salford in Greater Manchester. 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. The last review of Salford was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1979 (Report no. 347).

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692), i.e. the need to:
  - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
  - secure effective and convenient local government; and
  - achieve equality of representation.
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.
- the general duty under section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1996 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002) i.e. to have due regard to
  - eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
  - promote equality of opportunity; and
  - promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Salford was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reviews*. This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. We can also propose changes to the electoral arrangements for parish and town councils in the city.

6 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as possible, equal representation across the city 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, or that changes should be made to the size of the council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit to the number of councillors that can be returned from each metropolitan city ward. However, the figure must be

divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan city wards currently return three councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could lead to an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 8 May 2002, when we wrote to Salford City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Greater Manchester Police Authority, The Local Government Association, Members of Parliament with constituencies 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 the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 25 February 2003 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Salford*, and ended on 22 April 2003. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

## 2 Current electoral arrangements

11 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. During the local government reorganisation of 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.

12 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.

13 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 are relatively rural. All wards are three-member wards.

14 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 with nine wards varying by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in Walkden South ward where each of the councillors represents 50% more electors than the city average.

15 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 3: Existing electoral arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 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	2,932	8
20 Worsley & Boothstown	3	11,223	3,741	40	11,583	3,861	43
<b>Totals</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>160,736</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>161,695</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<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.

Notes:

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 significantly 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 3. This is due to rounding.





### 3 Draft recommendations

16 During Stage One six representations were received, including city-wide schemes from Salford City Council, the Conservatives and Hope Action Group. We also received representations from Salford Constituency Liberal Democrats, Southgarth Area Residents Association, and one local resident. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Salford*.

17 Our draft recommendations were based on the City Council's proposals, which achieved some improvement in electoral equality. However, to improve electoral equality further while having regard to local community identities and interests, we decided to move away from the City Council's proposals in several areas. We proposed that:

- Salford City Council should continue to be served by 60 councillors;
- the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified, while one ward should retain its existing boundaries.

*Draft recommendation*

Salford City Council should comprise 60 councillors, serving 20 wards.

18 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 16 of the 20 wards varying by no more than 10% from the city average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with only one ward, Cadishead, varying by more than 10% from the average by 2006.



## 4 Responses to consultation

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

### Salford City Council

20 The City Council supported the draft recommendations which were based on its Stage One proposals. It also proposed that Trinity & Crescent ward be renamed Irwell Riverside.

### Community groups

21 The Community Boundary Working Group (CBWG) submitted two city-wide proposals. The signatories were from a variety of community groups and councillors. The submission was signed by representatives of Claremont Community Association (in liaison with Duchy Residents Association), Hope Action Group, Oakwood Community Group, Southgarth Residents Area Association, Claremont & Weaste Community Committee, The Meadows Community Resource Centre, Homewatch and Weaste Community Watch. It was also signed by Councillor Heywood (member for Weaste & Seedley), Councillor Owen (member for Claremont) and Councillor Powell, resident of Meadowgate and City of Manchester councillor.

22 The Southgarth Area Residents Association opposed the proposed Langworthy and Claremont wards. It was also a signatory of the CBWG's proposal.

### Other representations

23 Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry generally supported the draft recommendations. A local resident supported the CBWG's proposals and also proposed a minor amendment to strengthen the boundary between the Eccles and Weaste & Seedley wards.



## 5 Analysis and final recommendations

24 As described earlier, our prime objective 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'.

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

26 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.

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

### Electorate forecasts

28 Since 1975 there has been approximately a 20% decrease in the electorate of Salford city. At Stage One 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.

29 During Stage Four, Salford City Council re-examined its electorate figures and provided amended figures for both 2001 and 2006. The Council's new projections allocated an extra seven electors to its Stage One 2006 total of 161,692. They stated that this total had been 'altered by a very small amount due to rounding errors within the projection methodology used'. The total electorate in 2001 has not been affected by the revised figures. While these new figures affect five of the proposed wards in 2001 and 10 of the proposed wards in 2006 only in four wards would the electoral variances be affected by the changes. In the majority of the wards the changes are due 'to rounding error(s) within the projection process, and in one instance to typographical error'.

30 In four wards the City Council outlined other reasons for the changes to the electorate. It stated that the changes to the electorate in the proposed Cadishead and Irlam wards are 'due to an erroneous assumption regarding projected dwelling completions at Fairhills Road'. The City

Council stated that its new 'projections reflect a realistic assessment of projected dwelling completions during the period 2001/2006'. The most significant change to the electorate affects the proposed Broughton and Trinity & Crescent wards. The City Council looked at the distribution of projected electorate between the two wards and noted that the difference between its projections and those detailed in our draft recommendations is 'most probably attributable to differing assumptions regarding the distribution of electors within (the) polling district'.

31 The new figures have only a minor impact on electoral equality; the electoral variance does not change in any ward in 2001, and in 2006 three of the proposed wards, Broughton, Cadishead and Trinity & Crescent have electoral variances that slightly improve under the new figures. The electoral variance for the proposed Barton ward slightly worsens under the revised figures. We received no other comments on the Council's electorate forecasts during Stage Three and are content that the revised figures reflect the County Council's best estimate of the likely electorate.

## Council size

32 Salford City Council at present has 60 members. At Stage One 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.

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

34 We received no further comments regarding council size at Stage Three and are therefore endorsing our draft recommendation to retain a council size of 60.

## Electoral arrangements

35 During Stage Two officers from the Committee visited the area, and were of the view that the proposals put forward by the Conservatives and Hope Action Group and the partial scheme submitted by the Liberal Democrats contained revised warding arrangements which we were not persuaded provided for an adequate reflection of the statutory criteria and subsequently weakened the schemes as a whole. In addition, we received limited or no evidence and argumentation in support of these alternative proposals.

36 We were of the view that the proposals submitted by Hope Action Group had some merit. However, we were concerned that the scheme was derived from the desire to re-ward the Hope area in a particular way, with limited thought and argumentation being given to the consequent effects of the scheme across the city as a whole.

37 The City Council undertook a consultation exercise with interested parties, and provided comprehensive argumentation and evidence and we based our draft recommendations on the City Council's scheme. We considered 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 moved away from the City Council's proposals in a number of areas.

38 At Stage Three the City Council supported the draft recommendations, endorsing the amendments we made at Stage One. During Stage Four Councillor Owen, Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group, stated his concerns regarding the City Council's submission. He considered that there had been insufficient consultation on the City Council's proposals. He also stated that 'the make up of the Cabinet does not represent the political views of Salford (being made up entirely of Labour councillors)'. He argued that an 'all-party working party was established to discuss the Boundary Review [but that] opposition members of this working party were not consulted'. Consequently, Councillor Owen requested 'that the response from Salford Council is not seen as a response representing the views of the entire council'.

39 We offered Salford City Council the opportunity to respond to these comments, and they stated that the 'response from the City Council confirmed the position already established following a discussion at the meeting of the Cabinet and a debate in a full meeting of the City Council'. The City Council stated that it was 'acknowledged by all members of the working group, including the Leader of the Conservative Group and the then Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group that separate submissions would be made' as no cross-party consensus had been achieved. The Council went on to state that 'it would therefore have been wholly inappropriate to have re-convened the working party which effectively had finished its business in the knowledge that there was not at this stage [after publication of the draft recommendations] the common ground necessary to enable a response based on cross party consensus to be prepared'. The Council stated that 'at a debate in the meeting at Council held on 19<sup>th</sup> March...the then Deputy Leader, Councillor John Merry had indicated to the meeting that the draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee for England reflected broadly the submission made earlier by the City Council' and that 'a full debate took place at this meeting'. It stated that 'it was quite proper that the decision to agree the response should be taken by the Executive of the authority. The Cabinet acted properly and within the constitution in dealing with this matter'. The Council also stated that 'at the end of the consultation process...the City Council arranged a meeting of representatives of all our Community Committees...to debate the submissions to be made by the City Council'. It continued that 'it was also agreed that the other two political groups could use the opportunity of raising and having debated their proposed submissions'. The Council concluded that it had 'acted correctly in all matters relating to the periodic electoral review'.

40 Having considered Councillor Owen's comments and the City Council's response we consider that the Council has acted properly in relation to this review and are satisfied that the proposal received should be considered as the view of the City Council. We would also like to note that submissions are welcomed from all interested parties and that every submission is considered on its merits. The City Council's submission, therefore, would not carry any more weight than that of a minority party or individual.

41 We also received a submission from the Community Boundary Working Group (CBWG) comprising two detailed city-wide options with common supporting appendices and background information. Both options proposed substantially moving away from our draft recommendations throughout the city. It submitted two options so that its proposals do not 'stand or fall on the single issue of alternatives for Irlam and Cadishead'. In the eastern part of the city the wards for both options are identical. We note the level of support for the CBWG's proposals; seven community groups and councillors were named signatories. A considerable amount of detailed work and thought has clearly been put into the preparation of this submission and we note that the consequential effects of the scheme across the city as a whole have been considered and the scheme has considerable merit. However, Stage Three is for comments on the draft recommendations rather than for the submission of entirely new schemes and it would require exceptional circumstances for us to adopt a completely new scheme at Stage Three. While we note that the CBWG's proposed options do not propose amendments to every ward, adopting either of these options would involve substantial amendments to the draft recommendations across the city. However, such a substantial departure from our draft recommendations at Stage Four would leave us unable to consult locally on a number of significant changes and, in light of

the support for the draft recommendations from the City Council and Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the good levels of electoral equality that our draft recommendations provide, we do not consider that such significant amendments across the city are justified.

42 We consider that our draft recommendations provide a good balance between electoral equality, the reflection of community identities and the need to provide effective and convenient local government. Therefore we are confirming the majority of our draft recommendations as final. We are proposing a number of minor amendments to reflect access routes and to provide more clearly identifiable boundaries. We are amending the boundary between the proposed Eccles and Weaste & Seedley ward, as proposed by a local resident. We are proposing two other minor amendments in Eccles ward to strengthen the boundaries, as proposed by the CBWG, neither of which will affect any electors. We are proposing to rename Trinity & Crescent ward Irwell Riverside, as proposed by the City Council.

43 For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

i)	Cadishead and Irlam wards;	page 24
ii)	Little Hulton, Walkden North, Walkden South and Worsley & Boothstown wards;	page 26
iii)	Barton, Eccles and Winton wards;	page 28
iv)	Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards;	page 30
v)	Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards;	page 31
vi)	Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton wards;	page 34
vii)	Broughton and Kersal wards.	page 36

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

### **Cadishead and Irlam wards**

45 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 the 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).

46 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.

47 At Stage One, 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. 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. Hope Action Group proposed to use the M60 Motorway as an eastern boundary for the proposed ward.

48 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 an eastern boundary for the revised Irlam ward.



49 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we based our draft recommendations for this area on the proposals submitted by Salford City Council. We noted 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. Having visited the area, officers from the Boundary Committee concluded 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 concluded that the City Council's revised Irlam ward provided 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 could be improved upon to provide a better reflection of community identity. We therefore proposed that the area to the west of the M60 surrounding Liverpool Road should form part of the revised Barton ward.

50 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 concurred with this view and sought to determine a revised boundary which would be clearly identifiable while addressing the issue of electoral equality. We therefore proposed a revised boundary based on the use of Springfield Lane and Liverpool Road.

51 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Cadishead and Irlam wards would contain 15% and 11% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (12% and 8% fewer by 2006). As described earlier in this report, at Stage Four the City Council submitted revised figures for these two wards which result in an improved electoral variance for Cadishead ward. Under the revised figures the proposed Cadishead ward would contain 11% fewer electors than the city average by 2006. The electoral variance for the proposed Irlam ward would remain unchanged.

52 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 is situated on the western edge of the city. We were also content that this variance can be argued on community identity grounds in relation to our amendment to the proposed Irlam ward.

53 At Stage Three the City Council supported the draft recommendations for Cadishead and Irlam. The CBWG proposed two options for the Cadishead and Irlam wards. Option One of the CBWG's proposals was identical to our draft recommendations. Option Two of the CBWG's proposals attempted to address the electoral inequality in these wards, as outlined in our draft recommendations. Under Option Two it proposed that the area to the north of Springfield Lane and broadly to the south of Parkstone Road be transferred from the proposed Irlam ward to the proposed Cadishead ward. It also proposed that the area north of Liverpool Road, west of the M60 and south of the railway line be transferred to the Irlam ward which it proposed renaming Irlam and Peel Green West. It proposed that the boundary between the revised Irlam and Barton wards aligns with the boundary line of the Barton strategic employment site to the west of the boundary proposed in the draft recommendations. It stated that under Option Two there would be 'a better grouping of localities with common (future) community interests/concerns'.

54 As explained earlier, we have not been persuaded to adopt the CBWG's proposals in their entirety. It has therefore been difficult to adopt any of the wards it proposed because of the substantial knock-on effects adopting these wards would have across the city. The effects on the neighbouring wards in this area would be substantial under Option Two and although we

recognise the improvement to electoral equality we have not been persuaded to adopt the CBWG's scheme in this area. We also note that the City Council and the CBWG's Option One supported the draft recommendations in this area.

55 We received no other comments regarding this area and are subsequently confirming our draft recommendations as final, noting that the electoral variances in Cadishead ward have slightly improved under the City Council's revised electorate projections.

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

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

57 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 the 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).

58 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 remainder 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.

59 Finally, the City Council proposed two new wards, Boothstown and Worsley, which were 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.

60 The Conservatives' proposals in this area were identical 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 also advocated the inclusion of part of the existing Swinton South ward stating that this area 'considers itself part of Worsley rather than Swinton'.

61 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. Part of the remainder 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 remainder of the existing Walkden North and Walkden South wards would be combined to form a new Linnyslaw & Park ward. They also asserted 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.'

62 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 remainder 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 remainder 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.

63 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we based 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 considered that each of the proposals in this area had merit, utilising strong boundaries and providing for improved levels of electoral equality. On balance, however, we considered that the City Council's proposals provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. We also proposed a minor amendment to the eastern boundary of the proposed Worsley ward in order that Folly Brook be used as a boundary in its entirety, together with adopting the Conservatives' proposed ward name of Boothstown & Ellenbrook, which we considered to provide a better reflection of the constituent parts of this new ward.

64 Under our draft recommendations, the proposed 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).

65 During Stage Three the City Council and Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry endorsed the draft recommendations for this area. Under both of its options the CBWG proposed a minor amendment to strengthen the boundary between the proposed Worsley and Eccles wards. It proposed that the boundary follow the rear of the properties to the north of Monton Green, instead of Folly Brook which runs through the golf course as outlined under our draft recommendations. We note that at Stage One we amended the City Council's proposals to follow Folly Brook in its entirety as the eastern boundary of Worsley ward. However, we are adopting this minor amendment proposed by the CBWG as we have been persuaded that it will provide a stronger and more easily identifiable boundary. We are also including the golf course buildings in the proposed Worsley ward with the rest of the golf course. The CBWG proposed no other amendments to any of the other wards and we received no other comments on the proposed wards in this area. Therefore, in light of the support from the City Council we are endorsing our draft recommendations as final with one minor amendment as detailed above.

66 Under our final recommendations, the proposed 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**

67 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 the 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).

68 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.

69 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 considered that the residents in this area see the A57 as their 'main road' and it is used for both shopping and recreational facilities.

70 The Conservatives proposed a revised Eccles ward which would comprise parts of the existing Barton and Eccles ward. Part of the existing Eccles ward would be combined with part of the existing Winton ward to form a new Winton & Patricroft ward. Part of the existing Eccles ward and part of Swinton South ward would form a new Monton ward. The remainder of the existing Eccles ward would form part of a new Oakwood Park ward. Hope Action Group proposed four revised wards in this area. It proposed a new Eccles West ward, an Eccles with Barton ward, a new Ellesmere ward and a new Monton with Broad Oak ward.

71 Having considered the representations received at Stage One carefully, we based our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals. We considered that these proposals provided 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 did, however, propose an amendment to the proposed Barton ward to include the settlements to the west of the M60 motorway (surrounding Liverpool Road).

72 Having visited the area, officers from the committee considered that each of the proposals submitted in relation to this area had merit but that the City Council's proposals better reflected 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, having visited the area, officers from the Committee 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.

73 Under our draft recommendations the proposed 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). As described earlier in this report, at Stage Four the City Council submitted revised figures which result in the proposed Barton ward having a slightly worse level of electoral equality. Under the revised figures the proposed Barton ward would contain 6% fewer electors than the city average by 2006. The electoral variances for Eccles and Winton wards would remain unchanged.

74 At Stage Three the City Council and Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry supported the draft recommendations in this area. The CBWG proposed amendments to the proposed Eccles ward. In this area its Options One and Two were similar. Under both of the options that it proposed at Stage Three, the CBWG proposed an Eccles & Monton ward similar to the Eccles ward outlined in our draft recommendations. However, it proposed to amend the boundary between the proposed Worsley and Eccles wards, as detailed above. The CBWG also proposed to include Eccles College in the proposed Eccles ward to reflect its access route. Under Option Two it proposed to use Corporation Road/Bentcliffe Way as the boundary between the revised Eccles & Monton and Barton wards. This was also an additional option within Option One of the CBWG's proposal. Under both Option One and Two of its proposals, the CBWG proposed an additional option of incorporating the West One Trading Estate in the revised Eccles & Monton ward.

75 Under Option Two of its proposals the CBWG proposed alternative arrangements for the proposed Winton and Barton wards. In Winton it proposed the same ward as under the draft recommendations, less the area to the west of the M60, and including the Patricroft area to the west of the B5231, Green Lane. It proposed renaming this ward Winton and Patricroft North to reflect local community identity. To the south the CBWG proposed a revised Barton with Patricroft South ward. This western boundary of this proposed ward would extend west beyond the M60.

76 A local resident proposed that all of Park Road, including Dante Close, be united in the proposed Eccles ward. He stated that this would reinforce the 'clear on the ground association of Dante Close with Park Road'.

77 We have given careful consideration to the representations received at Stage Three, and are confirming as final our draft recommendations for the proposed Barton and Winton wards while adopting three minor amendments in the proposed Eccles ward. As noted before, we have not been persuaded to adopt the CBWG's proposals in their entirety. We have considered each individual amendment that it has proposed and in this area are adopting two of its proposals as we consider that they provide stronger boundaries than those outlined under our draft recommendations and do not have any significant consequential effects on neighbouring wards. We propose including Eccles College in Eccles ward to reflect access routes and to provide more effective and convenient local government. We have also been persuaded to amend the boundary between the Eccles and Worsley wards as detailed above. We considered the proposal of the local resident and consider that uniting the properties of Park Road and Dante Close in the Eccles ward would reflect community identities and provide more effective and convenient government without adversely affecting electoral equality.

78 As described earlier in this report, at Stage Four the City Council submitted revised figures which result in the proposed Barton ward having a slightly worse level of electoral equality. Under the revised figures the proposed Barton ward would contain 6% fewer electors than the city average by 2006. We note that this electoral variance is slightly worse than that outlined in our draft recommendations. However, we consider that this revised figure still provides an acceptable level of electoral equality in this area and in light of the support for the draft recommendations are endorsing our draft recommendations as final with just the three amendments outlined above.

79 Under our final recommendations the proposed Barton, Eccles and Winton wards would contain 9%, 3% and 5% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (6%, 4% and 3% more by 2006).

### **Pendlebury, Swinton North and Swinton South wards**

80 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 the 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).

81 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 remainder of the existing Swinton South ward would form part of the revised Claremont ward, as detailed below.

82 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.

83 The Conservatives proposed a new Clifton & Pendlebury ward which would be largely based on the existing Pendlebury ward. The Conservatives proposed broadly retaining the existing Swinton North ward, renaming the ward Swinton West. Parts of the existing Swinton South ward would form part of new Worsley and Monton wards. Part of the remaining existing Swinton South ward would form part of a new Oakwood Park ward. Finally the remainder of the existing Swinton South ward would be combined with part of the existing Pendlebury ward to form a new Swinton East ward.

84 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we based our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which were broadly similar to those put forward by Hope Action Group. However, we proposed a minor amendment to the western boundary of the proposed Swinton South ward to utilise Folly Brook as a boundary for its entirety, as detailed above.

85 Under our draft recommendations the proposed 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).

86 At Stage Three the City Council and Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry supported the draft recommendations. The CBWG proposed alternative arrangements for this area in both of its Options. Under Option One it proposed a Pendlebury & Clifton ward comprising the majority of the proposed Pendlebury ward, less the area to the south of the fire station and east of Bolton Road, which it proposed transferring into a new New Claremont ward. It also proposed to include the Royal Manchester Children's Hospital and the surrounding residential area in a new Pendlebury & Clifton ward along with Clifton Primary School and the

area to the west of Manchester Road, currently in the proposed Swinton North ward. The CBWG proposed retaining the rest of Swinton North ward but proposed renaming it Wardley & Moorside.

87 Under Option Two of the CBWG's proposals it proposed a new Pendlebury & Clifton ward identical to that in Option One. Its proposed Swinton and Wardley & Moorside wards are similar to its Option One proposals but under Option Two the CBWG proposes retaining the existing ward boundary between the two wards. Under both options the CBWG proposed to transfer Eccles College out of the proposed Swinton South ward and into an amended Eccles & Monton ward to the south, as outlined earlier.

88 Having carefully considered all representations received at Stage Three and in light of the support from the City Council and the Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations as final with one amendment. We considered the CBWG's proposals for this area but, as discussed earlier we have not been persuaded to adopt either of its proposals in its entirety. Adopting either of its options at this stage would leave us unable to consult locally on a number of significant changes and, in light of the support for the draft recommendations we do not consider that such significant amendments are justified. Although we have not been persuaded to adopt the city-wide proposals put forward by the CBWG in their entirety, we are adopting its proposal to include Eccles College in a revised Eccles ward rather than the proposed Swinton South ward, as detailed previously.

89 Under our final recommendations, the proposed 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**

90 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 the 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).

91 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 provision of facilities 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.

92 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'.

93 As discussed earlier, the Conservatives proposed a new Oakwood Park ward that would comprise parts of the existing Claremont, Eccles and Swinton South wards. The remainder of the existing Claremont ward would be combined with part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward to form a new Buile Hill ward.

94 Part of the Weaste & Seedley ward would be combined with the whole of the existing Langworthy ward, part of the existing Pendleton ward and part of the existing Blackfriars ward to form a new Langworth & Seedley ward. Finally the remainder of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward, the area to the south of the M602 would form part of a new Salford Quays ward.

95 Hope Action Group's proposals were significantly different to the City Council's proposals in this area. It proposed a new New Claremont ward which would be based on the existing Claremont ward. The remainder of the existing Claremont ward would be combined with part of the existing Eccles ward and part of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward to form a new Ellesmere ward. The remainder of the existing Weaste & Seedley ward would be combined with part of the existing Langworthy ward and part of the existing Ordsall ward to form a revised Weaste & Seedley ward. The remainder of the existing Langworthy ward would form part of a new Pendleton with Blackfriars ward.

96 The Liberal Democrats proposed a revised Claremont ward which would be based on the existing ward. They proposed a revised Weaste & Seedley ward which would comprise part of the existing ward, together with the area to the west of Langworthy Road from the existing Langworthy ward. The remainder of the existing Langworthy ward would be divided between new Pendleton West and Pendleton East wards while the remainder of the existing Weaste & Seedley and Claremont wards would form part of a new Pendleton West ward.

97 Home Watch suggested some possible re-warding to the existing Claremont and Weaste & Seedley wards which were broadly similar to those proposals put forward by Hope Action Group.

98 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we based our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals, which we considered provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria, while facilitating our proposals across the city as a whole. We noted 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.

99 On balance, and taking into account our proposals elsewhere in the city, we concluded that the City Council's proposals provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. However, we proposed an amendment to the eastern boundary of the proposed Langworthy ward in order to provide for a more clearly identifiable boundary. This amendment was based on the proposal submitted by Hope Action Group and resulted 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.

100 Under our draft recommendations the proposed 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).

101 At Stage Three the City Council stated that it 'supports the Committee's recommendations for Claremont, Langworthy, and Weaste & Seedley wards, on grounds of electoral equality, strength of boundaries and community identity'. Options One and Two of the CBWG's proposals were identical in these areas and substantially moved away from the draft recommendations. Its proposals in this area are based on community identities and unite the Duchy Estate with the electorate to the west. The CBWG proposed a New Claremont ward



comprising the eastern part of the proposed Claremont ward, that area to the east of Claremont School and Lightoaks Park and the Duchy Estate. It also proposed including the northern part of the proposed Langworthy ward, the area broadly to the north of Seedley Road, in this New Claremont ward.

102 To the south of this, the CBWG proposed a new Pendleton & Seedley ward to replace the proposed Langworthy ward. The CBWG proposed renaming the ward because the name Langworthy 'is still felt by many residents of Salford to be a stigma associated with past national adverse publicity'. The proposed Pendleton & Seedley ward would have the same eastern boundary as the proposed Langworthy ward but the area north of Seedley Road would be transferred to the New Claremont ward. The western boundary of the proposed Pendleton & Seedley would be the B5228, currently in the proposed Weaste & Seedley ward. The CBWG also proposed an Oakwood & Hope with Willows ward to replace the proposed Weaste & Seedley ward. This wards southern boundary would be the M602. To the north it proposed including the western part of the proposed Weaste & Seedley ward, that area to the west of the B5228 and the western part of the proposed Claremont ward, that area to the west of Claremont school and Lightoaks Park. The CBWG stated that the polling districts that make up this ward are 'at the core of the old City of Salford and which have been/are the focus of targeted regeneration activity and between which there is easy access'.

103 The Southgarth Area Residents Association were signatories to the CBWG's proposals and also sent in a separate submission regarding the proposed Langworthy and Claremont wards. It stated that the 'proposed boundary changes from Claremont into Langworthy will break up our community'. It stated that there were poor transport links within the proposed Langworthy ward and that it would be difficult for people to get involved in community activities if the proposed ward were to be implemented. It also proposed that the name of Langworthy 'should be dispensed with'.

104 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage Three we are endorsing our draft recommendations as final in their entirety. We considered a number of amendments but have not been persuaded that they would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than our draft recommendations.

105 The CBWG stated that its proposed New Claremont ward provided 'strong, readily identifiable, on the ground features and relates well to the boundaries of regeneration schemes'. However, we are unable to take account of factors such as regeneration schemes and the provision of funding when developing our proposals. We welcome the observations regarding the Duchy Estate, which we invited comments on in our draft recommendations. However, the City Council supported this particular area of our draft recommendations and we have not been persuaded to move away from them, particularly as they facilitate our proposals in the rest of the city. Adopting the CBWG's proposals would have a considerable impact on the surrounding areas which at this stage we would be unable to consult on and, as discussed earlier, we do not consider that such significant amendments across the city are justified.

106 We noted the proposals to rename the Langworthy ward. However, as we are not adopting the CBWG's proposals in this area we do not consider that the name Pendleton & Seedley would reflect the constituent parts of the proposed ward and are therefore proposing to retain the name Langworthy. We are therefore endorsing our draft recommendations as final in this area.

107 Under our final recommendations the proposed Claremont, Langworthy and Weaste & Seedley wards would contain 3%, 19% and 1% more electors per councillor than the city average respectively (2% more, 6% more and 5% fewer by 2006).

## **Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton wards**

108 The existing wards of Blackfriars, Ordsall and Pendleton are situated in the east of the city. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the 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).

109 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 of 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 remainder 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 remainder 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 reflects strong community identities. The remainder 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.

110 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. Part of the remainder 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). Part of the existing Pendleton ward would form part of a new Langworthy & Seedley ward, 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.

111 Under Hope Action Group's proposals, part of the existing Ordsall ward would form part of a revised Weaste & Seedley ward. The remainder 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 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 remainder of the existing Langworthy ward to form a new Pendleton with Blackfriars ward. Finally, the remainder 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.

112 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, and 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 remainder of the existing Pendleton ward, the area broadly to the north-east of the railway line, would be combined with the remainder 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 remainder of the existing Blackfriars ward would form part of a revised Broughton ward.

113 Home Watch supported Hope Action Group's proposed Pendleton with Blackfriars ward, and opposed the City Council's proposal to remove the existing Blackfriars ward.

114 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we based our draft recommendations for this area on the City Council's proposals. This was 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 noted that the proposals in relation to the proposed Ordsall ward were broadly similar under the City Council's, the Liberal Democrats and Hope Action Group's proposals. Having visited the area, officers from the Committee concluded that the areas either side of Trafford Road are similar in character and should form part of the same city ward. We concluded that, on balance, the City Council's proposed Ordsall ward provided for the best reflection of the statutory criteria. However, we proposed 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.

115 We proposed an amendment to the southern boundary of the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward in order to provide a more clearly identifiable boundary. We concluded that the River Irwell is a strong boundary in this area. We therefore proposed 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 also considered making an amendment to the northwestern boundary of the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we considered that there would be merit in the Duchy Estate forming part of the proposed Pendlebury or Claremont wards with which it has close 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 did not consider that the identities and interests of this community would be significantly adversely affected under our draft recommendations.

116 Under our draft recommendations the proposed 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). As described earlier in this report, at Stage Four the City Council submitted revised figures for some wards which result in a slightly improved electoral variance for the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward. Under the revised figures Trinity & Crescent ward would contain 5% fewer electors than the city average by 2006. The electoral variances for Ordsall ward would remain unchanged.

117 At Stage Three the City Council supported the draft recommendations and the amendments that were made to the City Council's Stage One proposals 'on the grounds of strength of physical boundaries, community identity and electoral equality'. In our draft recommendations we invited further views on the decision to include the Duchy Estate within the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward. The City Council considered that our draft recommendations provided the 'most appropriate arrangement for the Duchy Estate', stating that the Duchy Estate and Irlams O'th Height are dissimilar 'in terms of physical character, socio-economic characteristics and community identity'. The City Council also proposed to rename the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward Irwell Riverside.

118 The CBWG proposed an identical Trinity & Crescent/Riverside ward under both Options One and Two of its submission. The proposed ward was broadly similar to the Trinity & Crescent ward outlined in our draft recommendations but transferred the Duchy Estate into its proposed

New Claremont ward with the Irlams O'th Height area. It proposed to include the residents of the 'predominantly residential area bounded by Chapel Street, Trinity Way, the railway viaduct and Oldfield Road' in the Trinity & Crescent/Riverside ward. In the south, in both of its options the CBWG proposed a new Metro with Quays ward which shares the same southern boundary as the proposed Ordsall ward outlined in our draft recommendations. In the west the CBWG proposed substantial changes. The western boundary of the proposed Metro with Quays ward would follow Gilda Brook Road and incorporate the southern part of the proposed Weaste & Seedley ward. All of this ward would be south of the M602.

119 Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry supported the draft recommendations in this area, stating that 'it provides a good opportunity to bring together similar communities'. We received no other proposals regarding this area.

120 Having carefully considered the representations received at Stage One we are endorsing the majority of our draft recommendations as final, with one amendment. We considered the City Council's proposal to rename the proposed Trinity & Crescent ward Irwell Riverside and share the opinion that this proposed name reflects the geography of the ward. We are therefore adopting it in our final recommendations. We noted the CBWG's proposals, but as discussed earlier have not been persuaded to adopt their proposals due to the significant knock-on effects across the city. Therefore, with the exception of one ward name change we are confirming our draft recommendations as final.

121 Under our final recommendations, the proposed Ordsall and Irwell Riverside wards would contain 32% and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the city average respectively (8% and 5% fewer by 2006).

### **Broughton and Kersal wards**

122 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 the 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).

123 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 remainder 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'.

124 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 remainder 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 remainder of the existing Broughton ward would form part of a revised Blackfriars ward, as detailed above.

125 Hope Action Group's proposals in this area were broadly similar to those put forward by the City Council, and were 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, as well as the Lower Broughton area from the existing Kersal ward.

126 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.

127 Having considered the representations received at Stage One, we based 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 in our draft recommendations. Both the Conservatives' and the Liberal Democrats' proposals breach the river and we were therefore not persuaded that they should be adopted. We noted that the proposals submitted by the City Council and Hope Action Group were similar in relation to the proposed Kersal ward and broadly identical in relation to the proposed Broughton ward. We therefore based 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.

128 Under our draft recommendations the proposed 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). As described earlier in this report, at Stage Four the City Council submitted revised figures for some wards which result in a slightly improved electoral variance for Broughton ward. Under the revised figures Broughton ward would contain 1% more electors than the city average by 2006. The electoral variances for Kersal ward would remain unchanged.

129 At Stage Three the City Council and the Manchester Chamber of Commerce and Industry supported our draft recommendations and the use of the River Irwell as a boundary for the Broughton ward. We received no other proposals regarding this area at Stage Three and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

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

## Electoral cycle

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

## Conclusions

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

- We are proposing minor amendments to the boundaries between the proposed Eccles and Worsley wards, the proposed Eccles and Swinton South wards and the proposed Eccles and Weaste & Seedley wards to provide more easily identifiable boundaries and to reflect access routes.
- we propose to rename Trinity & Crescent ward Irwell Riverside.

133 We conclude that, in Salford:

- a council of 60 members should be retained;
- there should be 20 wards, as at present;
- the boundaries of 19 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

*Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	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

135 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 15 to 4. This level of electoral equality would improve further by 2006, with only one ward, Cadishead varying by more than 10% from the average, at 11%. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

*Final 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 and in Appendix A and the large maps.

*Map 2: Final recommendations for Salford*





## 6 What happens next?

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

137 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 8 October 2003, and The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by that date. They particularly welcome any comments on the first draft of the Order, which will implement the new arrangements.

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

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

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



# Appendix A

## Final 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 proposed warding arrangements for Salford.

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

# Appendix B

## Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order

### **Preamble**

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

### **Citation and commencement**

This establishes the name of the Order and when it will come into force.

### **Interpretation**

This defines terms that are used in the Order.

### **Wards of the city of Salford**

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

### **Elections of the council of the city of Salford**

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

### **Maps**

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

### **Electoral registers**

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

### **Revocation**

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

### **Explanatory note**

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

# Appendix C

## First draft of electoral change Order for Salford

---

### STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

---

**2003 No.**

## **LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND**

### **The City of Salford (Electoral Changes) Order 2003**

*Made* - - - - - *2003*

*Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)*

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

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

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

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

#### **Citation and commencement**

- 1.—(1) This Order may be cited as the City of Salford (Electoral Changes) Order 2003.
- (2) This Order shall come into force –
  - (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to any election to be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004, on the day after that on which it is made;

---

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

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

(c) The Electoral Commission was established by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c.41). The functions of the Secretary of State, under sections 13 to 15 and 17 of the Local Government Act 1992 (c.19), to the extent that they relate to electoral changes within the meaning of that Act, were transferred with modifications to the Electoral Commission on 1st April 2002 (S.I. 2001/3962).

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

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

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

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

### **Interpretation**

**2.** In this Order –

“city” means the city of Salford;

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

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

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

### **Wards of the city of Salford**

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

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

### **Elections of the council of the city of Salford**

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

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

---

(a) See the City of Salford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980 (S.I. 1980/63).

(b) Article 4 provides for a single election of all the councillors and for reversion to the system of election by thirds, as established by section 7 of the Local Government Act 1972 (c.70).

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

## Maps

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

## Electoral registers

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

## Revocation

7. The City of Salford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1980(b) is revoked, save for articles 8 and 9(7).

Sealed with the seal of the Electoral Commission on the            day of            2003

Chairman of the Commission

Secretary to the Commission

## SCHEDULE

article 3

### NAMES OF WARDS

Barton	Irwell Riverside	Swinton South
Boothstown and Ellenbrook	Kersal	Walkden North
Broughton	Langworthy	Walkden South
Cadishead	Little Hulton	Weaste and Seedley
Claremont	Ordsall	Winton
Eccles	Pendlebury	Worsley
Irlam	Swinton North	

---

(a) As to electoral registration officers and the register of local government electors, *see* sections 8 to 13 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2).

(b) S.I. 1980/63.



## **EXPLANATORY NOTE**

*(This note is not part of the Order)*

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

The modifications are *indicate the modifications*.

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

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the city and provides for the creation of 20 new wards. That article and the Schedule also make provision for the names and areas of, and numbers of councillors for, the new wards.

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

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

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

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