

Final recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements
for Pendle in Lancashire

Report to the Secretary of State for the
Environment, Transport and the Regions

September 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no: 170

CONTENTS

	page
LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE	<i>v</i>
SUMMARY	<i>vii</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>3</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>7</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>9</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>25</i>
APPENDIX	
A Final Recommendations for Pendle: Detailed Mapping	<i>27</i>

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



Local Government Commission for England

5 September 2000

Dear Secretary of State

On 7 September 1999 the Commission began a periodic electoral review of Pendle under the Local Government Act 1992. We published our draft recommendations in February 2000 and undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

We have now prepared our final recommendations in the light of the consultation. We have confirmed our draft recommendations in their entirety. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Pendle.

We recommend that Pendle Borough Council should be served by 49 councillors representing 20 wards, and that changes should be made to ward boundaries in order to improve electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria. We recommend that the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

The Local Government Bill, containing legislative proposals for a number of changes to local authority electoral arrangements, is currently being considered by Parliament. However, until such time as that new legislation is in place we are obliged to conduct our work in accordance with current legislation, and to continue our current approach to periodic electoral reviews.

I would like to thank members and officers of the Borough Council and other local people who have contributed to the review. Their co-operation and assistance have been very much appreciated by Commissioners and staff.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Malcolm Grant'.

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT
Chairman

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Pendle on 7 September 1999. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 15 February 2000, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation.

- **This report summarises the representations we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to the Secretary of State.**

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

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

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2) are that:

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

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

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

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

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

All further correspondence on these recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions, who will not make an order implementing the Commission's recommendations before 17 October 2000:

**The Secretary of State
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Local Government Sponsorship Division
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU**

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

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

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

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

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Pendle

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

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

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

1 INTRODUCTION

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

2 This was our first review of the electoral arrangements of Pendle. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in July 1975 (Report No. 20). The electoral arrangements of Lancashire County Council were last reviewed in November 1980 (Report No. 399). We intend reviewing the County Council's electoral arrangements in time for the 2005 county elections.

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

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

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

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

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

7 The broad objective of PERs is to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the borough as a whole. Our aim is to achieve as low a level of electoral imbalance as is practicable, having regard to our statutory criteria. We will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward.

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

8 We are not prescriptive on council size. We start from the general assumption that the existing council size already secures effective and convenient local government in that borough but we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be so. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified: in particular, we do not accept that an increase in a borough's electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other boroughs.

9 In July 1998, the Government published a White Paper, *Modern Local Government – In Touch with the People*, which set out legislative proposals for local authority electoral arrangements. In two-tier areas, it proposed introducing a pattern in which both the district and county councils would hold elections every two years, i.e. in year one half of the district council would be elected, in year two half the county council would be elected, and so on. The Government stated that local accountability would be maximised where every elector has an opportunity to vote every year, thereby pointing to a pattern of two-member wards (and divisions) in two-tier areas. However, it stated that there was no intention to move towards very large electoral areas in sparsely populated rural areas, and that single-member wards (and electoral divisions) would continue in many authorities. The proposals were taken forward in a Local Government Bill, published in December 1999, and are currently being considered by Parliament.

10 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including the Lancashire districts, that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State's intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas.

11 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 7 September 1999, when we wrote to Pendle Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Lancashire Association of Town & Parish Councils, parish and town Councils in the borough, the Member of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough and the Members of the European Parliament for the North West region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 29 November 1999. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

12 Stage Three began on 15 February 2000 with the publication of our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Pendle in Lancashire*, and ended on 10 April 2000. Comments were sought on our preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four we reconsidered our draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation and now publish our final recommendations.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

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

Map 1: Existing Wards in Pendle

Figure 3: Existing Electoral Arrangements

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

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

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

3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

19 During Stage One we received five representations, including a borough-wide scheme from Pendle Borough Council, and representations from Blacko Parish Council, Brierfield Town Council, North West Conservatives and a 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 Pendle in Lancashire*.

20 Our draft recommendations were based on the Borough Council's proposals, which achieved improved levels of electoral equality, and provided a mix of one, two and three-member wards throughout the borough. However, we moved away from the Borough Council's scheme in six areas, affecting nine wards, using options generated by Council officers during the early stages of the review process, together with some of our own proposals. We proposed that:

- Pendle Borough Council should be served by 49 councillors, compared with the current 51, representing 20 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified, while three wards should retain their existing boundaries;
- revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Barrowford parish;
- revised warding arrangements for Brierfield Town Council.

Draft Recommendation

Pendle Borough Council should comprise 49 councillors, serving 20 wards. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

21 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 18 of the 20 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all 20 wards expected to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.

4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

22 During the consultation on our draft recommendations report, eight representations were received. A list of all respondents is available on request from the Commission. All representations may be inspected at the offices of Pendle Borough Council and the Commission.

Pendle Borough Council

23 The Borough Council supported our draft recommendations in their entirety.

Parish Councils

24 We received three representations from parish councils. Barley Parish Council opposed our recommendation to transfer Blacko Parish to a new Blacko & Higherford ward. Blacko Parish Council also opposed our proposed Blacko & Higherford ward, arguing that Blacko has more in common with the other Pendleside villages than with Higherford. Finally, Old Laund Booth Parish Council supported our proposed Old Laund Booth and Higham & Pendleside wards.

Other Representations

25 A further four representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from a councillor and three local residents. Councillor David supported our draft recommendations in relation to the proposed Barrowford, Blacko & Higherford, Higham & Pendleside and Old Laund Booth wards. One resident supported our proposals in relation to the proposed Barrowford and Blacko & Higherford wards, while a further resident opposed the proposed Blacko & Higherford ward. In addition, another local resident opposed our proposed Higham & Pendleside ward, arguing that Higham shares little in common with the Pendleside area, and expressed support for single-member wards in Pendle.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

26 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Pendle is, so far as reasonably practicable and consistent with the statutory criteria, to achieve electoral equality. In doing so we have regard to section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 – the need to secure effective and convenient local government, and reflect the identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

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

28 It is therefore impractical to design an electoral scheme which provides for exactly the same number of electors per councillor in every ward of an authority. There must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach, in the context of the statutory criteria, is that such flexibility must be kept to a minimum.

29 Our *Guidance* states that 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 kept to the minimum, such an objective should be the starting point in any review. We therefore strongly recommend that, in formulating electoral schemes, local authorities and other interested parties should start from the standpoint of absolute electoral equality and only then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity and interests. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of change in electorates.

Electorate Forecasts

30 At Stage One the Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 4 per cent from 63,450 to 65,927 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Brierfield and Waterside wards, although some is also expected in Southfield ward. The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, and the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. In our draft recommendations report we accepted that this is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the forecast electorates, we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

31 We received no comments on the Council’s electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates currently available.

Council Size

32 As already explained, the Commission’s starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates effective and convenient local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case.

33 Pendle Borough Council is at present served by 51 councillors. At Stage One the Borough Council proposed a reduction in council size from 51 to 49. It stated that there was “no compelling reason for increasing or reducing the number of councillors in the light of likely changes to the political structure”. It therefore constructed its proposals on the assumption that the existing number of councillors secured effective and convenient local government. It proposed a decrease of two to 49 members in order to develop a “detailed, rational and sensible” scheme which would achieve an acceptable level of electoral equality.

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

35 In our draft recommendations report we considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, and concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would be best met by a council size of 49 members.

36 During Stage Three the Borough Council supported our proposals with regard to council size. A local resident reiterated her proposal for a significant reduction in council size; however, no detailed proposals as to how this could be achieved were submitted. Accordingly, we remain persuaded that the balance of evidence supports reducing the number of councillors in Pendle to 49, which we consider would achieve the best balance between the number of members required to facilitate effective and convenient local government, and also reflect the identities and interests of local communities. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendation for a council size of 49 as final.

Electoral Arrangements

37 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One, including the borough-wide scheme from the Borough Council. From these representations, some considerations emerged which helped to inform us when preparing our draft recommendations.

38 The Council’s proposals were for a reduction in council size from 51 to 49. The proposals resulted in improved levels of electoral equality, with the number of wards where the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10 per cent from the borough average reducing from ten to two. This level of electoral equality would improve further over the next five years, with all the proposed wards varying by no more than 10 per cent in 2004.

39 We recognised the improved electoral equality achieved by the Borough Council’s scheme, compared to the existing arrangements, and concluded that we should base our draft recommendations on its proposals. However, in order to provide for more clearly identifiable boundaries and having regard to local community identities and interests, we decided to move away from the Borough Council’s proposal in six areas.

40 In response to our draft recommendations report, we received a degree of local support, and we propose that our draft recommendations should be endorsed. We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

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

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

Barrowford, Fence and Pendleside wards

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

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

44 Under the Borough Council’s proposals, Blacko & Higherford, Barrowford, and Higham & Pendleside wards would contain 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Old Laund Booth ward would contain 4 per cent

fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years with the exception of Old Laund Booth ward which would contain 8 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004.

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

46 We concluded that the Borough Council's proposals would provide for improved levels of electoral equality while having regard to the statutory criteria, and were content to adopt them as part of our draft recommendations. While we noted the comments made by Blacko Parish Council, we considered that the Borough Council's proposals would reasonably reflect communities in the area, and would better address the high levels of electoral inequality which currently exist. We recognised that in order to address the significant levels of under-representation in Barrowford ward, the council had divided Barrowford parish between wards. We recognised that this represented a significant change and welcomed the views of residents and interested parties on this proposal at Stage Three.

47 At Stage Three, the Borough Council and Councillor David supported our draft recommendations for this area. Old Laund Booth Parish Council supported our proposals in relation to Old Laund Booth and Higham & Pendleside wards. A local resident also supported our draft recommendations, with specific reference to the proposed Blacko & Higherford ward.

48 Barley Parish Council opposed our draft recommendations in relation to Higham & Pendleside ward, arguing that they do not have the same geographical connections with Higham as they do with Blacko, and stated their preference for retaining the existing warding arrangements. Blacko Parish Council opposed our proposed Blacko & Higherford ward, arguing that it considers Blacko to have more in common with its neighbouring Pendleside villages than with Higherford. A resident opposed our proposals for this area and favoured largely retaining the existing Fence and Pendleside wards. Another local resident opposed our draft recommendations for this area, with specific reference to the transfer of the Higham area from Fence ward. Alternative proposals were submitted based around retaining Higham as part of Fence ward, Blacko as part of Pendleside ward and combining the east end of Fence ward with Barrowford ward.

49 Having carefully considered the representations received, we have not been persuaded to change our draft recommendation for Barrowford, Blacko & Higherford, Higham & Pendleside and Old Laund Booth wards. We note that our proposals have received a degree of local support and have been endorsed by the Borough Council. While we note the concerns of Barley and Blacko parishes and a local resident, we remain of the view that the retention of the existing warding arrangements in this area, as proposed by these respondents, would not be a viable option due to the high levels of electoral inequality which would continue. We have also considered the alternative proposals for this area submitted by a local resident, and note that they would result in the division of the Fence community. We consider that such an arrangement would adversely affect community ties in this area, and we are therefore not persuaded to put these proposals

forward as part of our final recommendations. We consider that our proposals in this area would better address the high levels of electoral inequality which currently exist, as well as reflecting community identities and interests.

50 Under our final recommendations, Barrowford, Blacko & Higherford and Higham & Pendleside wards would contain 2 per cent, 3 per cent and 6 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1 per cent fewer, 3 per cent more and 5 per cent more by 2004). Old Laund Booth ward would contain 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (8 per cent fewer by 2004). The proposed boundary between Barrowford and Blacko & Higherford wards is illustrated on Map A2 at Appendix A.

Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield wards

51 The existing wards of Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield are situated in the south of the borough, and form part of the unparished town of Nelson. All three wards are currently represented by three councillors. Under current arrangements, Walverden and Whitefield wards have relatively poor electoral equality with 20 per cent and 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while Bradley ward contains 3 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. This level of electoral equality is predicted to marginally deteriorate by 2004.

52 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed largely retaining these wards, subject to some boundary modifications. It proposed modifying the existing Whitefield ward by altering the boundary with Bradley ward to follow Pendle Street and the M65. In order to improve the electoral equality of Bradley ward further, it proposed that part of the existing Marsden ward be combined with the remainder of the existing Bradley ward. The Council also proposed that the boundary between Walverden and Whitefield wards be modified so that it continues along the centre of Manchester Road to the junction with Broadway, then along Broadway/Hibson Street to Sugar Street and the intersection of the railway line. The remaining substantial portion of Walverden ward would be combined with part of the existing Whitefield ward to form a revised two-member Walverden ward.

53 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the revised Bradley and Whitefield wards would contain 9 per cent and 5 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while the revised Walverden ward would contain 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve slightly over the next five years. We received one other submission in relation to this area, from the North West Conservatives, who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

54 In our draft recommendations report, we considered the Borough Council's proposals for this area and concluded that they provided a reasonable level of electoral equality and satisfactorily met the statutory criteria. However, we proposed several minor modifications to the Borough Council's proposals which we considered would better reflect community identity and provide for more easily identifiable boundaries. We proposed that the boundary between Walverden and Whitefield wards should follow the railway line to the rear of the properties on Manchester Road to its junction with Lomeshaye Road. We also proposed that the boundary between the proposed Bradley and Whitefield wards should be modified in order that the area north of Barrowford Road

surrounding Nelson & Colne College of Further Education and south of Barrowford Road, namely Gill Street and Surrey Road, be transferred to Bradley ward.

55 In response to our draft recommendations the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area in their entirety. We received no further submissions in relation to this area and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations, the revised Bradley and Whitefield wards would contain 10 per cent and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average (6 per cent and 3 per cent more in 2004). Walverden ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average (5 per cent fewer in 2004). The proposed boundaries for Bradley, Walverden and Whitefield wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield wards

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

57 At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed combining part of the existing Marsden ward with Bradley ward, as detailed above. It proposed that part of Marsden ward should be combined with the majority of the existing Southfield ward to the west of Marsden Hall Road, together with the Linkside Avenue area, to form a revised three-member Southfield ward. It also proposed a small boundary modification between Marsden and Waterside wards. The remainder of the existing Marsden ward would form a revised two-member Marsden ward. Under the Council's proposals, part of the existing Southfield ward would be combined with the majority of the existing Clover Hill ward. The Council also proposed a minor boundary modification between Clover Hill and Walverden wards.

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

59 In our draft recommendations report, we noted that the Borough Council's proposals for this area provided for a reasonable level of electoral equality and addressed the imbalances that currently existed in these wards. We were therefore content to substantially endorse the Borough Council's proposals for this area. We did, however, propose two amendments to its proposals. We noted that, under the Borough Council's proposals, Deerstone Road, Marsden Hall Road and Town House Road would be divided between the two wards of Marsden and Southfield. We proposed that the area bounded by Town House Road and Linkside Avenue should remain in Marsden ward rather than being transferred to Southfield ward. Instead, we proposed that the boundary between the two wards should continue along Hallam Road to Hazelwood Road, then

south down the middle of Hazelwood Road to Bakerhouse Road. We considered that the Borough Council's proposal for a minor modification to the boundary between Marsden and Waterside wards provided for good communication links for an area which, under existing arrangements, is geographically isolated from the rest of Marsden ward. We considered that this argument could be extended further to include Height Side Bungalows and Hubbs Tenement. We believed that these electors would be better represented within a revised Waterside ward, and proposed amending the boundary accordingly.

60 In response to our draft recommendations the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area in their entirety. We received no further submissions in relation to this area and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations, the revised Marsden ward would contain 3 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, while Southfield ward would contain 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor. This level of electoral equality is predicted to marginally improve over the next five years, so that Marsden ward would contain 1 per cent more electors than the borough average and Southfield ward would contain 3 per cent fewer electors than the borough average by 2004. Clover Hill ward would have equal to the average number of electors per councillor (2 per cent fewer by 2004). The proposed boundaries for Clover Hill, Marsden and Southfield wards are illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Brierfield and Reedley wards

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

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

63 Under the Borough Council's proposals, the proposed Brierfield and Reedley wards would contain 7 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years, with Brierfield ward containing 1 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average, and Reedley ward containing 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004.

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

65 In our draft recommendations report, we considered that the Borough Council's proposals for this area provided for reasonable levels of electoral equality while limiting the amount of change, by retaining a number of existing boundaries. We noted Brierfield Town Council's comments arguing for no change, and recognised that, in electoral equality terms, the Borough Council's proposals were only marginally superior to the existing arrangements. However, we concurred with the Borough Council that Halifax Road would form a more identifiable northern boundary for Brierfield ward and were content to put this change forward as part of our draft recommendations. We proposed one further change to the boundary between Brierfield and Reedley ward. We proposed that the ward boundary should run to the rear of properties on Kings Causeway so that all the properties contained in this area would form part of the same ward.

66 In response to our draft recommendations the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area in their entirety. We received no further submissions in relation to this area and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations, the revised Brierfield and Reedley wards would contain 10 per cent and 3 per cent fewer electors than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is predicted to improve over the next five years with Brierfield and Reedley wards containing 2 per cent and 1 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively by 2004. The proposed boundary between Brierfield and Reedley wards is illustrated on the large map at the back of this report.

Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge wards

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

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

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

in 2004. We received one other submission in relation to this area, from the North West Conservatives, who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

70 In our draft recommendations report, we considered that the Borough Council's proposals for this area achieved acceptable levels of electoral equality as well as meeting the statutory criteria. We recognised that Earby ward is relatively under-represented, but considered that the existing ward reflects community identities well and is coterminous with parish boundaries. We also noted that electoral equality is projected to improve in the ensuing five years. In relation to Foulridge ward, we noted that under a revised council size of 49, the existing ward would have 14 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004 if it were to remain unchanged. We felt that this level of electoral inequality should be addressed as part of this review. We therefore proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals for this area as our draft recommendations.

71 In response to our draft recommendations the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area in their entirety. We received no further submissions in relation to this area and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations, the proposed Coates, Craven, Earby and Foulridge wards would have equal to the average, 4 per cent more, 11 per cent more and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years, with all wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average in 2004. The proposed boundary between Horsfield and Foulridge wards is illustrated on Map A3 at Appendix A.

Boulsworth, Horsfield, Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards

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

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

74 Under the Borough Council's proposals, Boulsworth, Horsfield and Waterside wards would contain 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 13 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, while the proposed Vivary Bridge ward would contain 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain relatively constant over the next five years, with the exception of Waterside ward, which is projected to contain 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average by 2004. We received one other submission in relation to this area, from the North West Conservatives, who fully supported the Borough Council's proposals.

75 In our draft recommendations report, we considered that the Borough Council's proposals for this area would provide for improved electoral equality while having regard for the identities and interests of the local community. We therefore proposed endorsing them as part of our draft recommendations, subject to two minor boundary modifications. Firstly, we proposed modifying the boundary between Waterside and Vivary Bridge wards such that it would follow the A6068 Vivary Way and M65 motorway. Secondly, we proposed a further amendment to the boundary between Waterside and Marsden wards, to incorporate Hubbs Tenement and Heightside Bungalows in Waterside ward, as their sole access is from this ward, as detailed earlier.

76 In response to our draft recommendations the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area in their entirety. We received no further submissions in relation to this area and are therefore content to endorse our draft recommendations as final. Under our final recommendations, Boulsworth, Horsfield and Waterside wards would contain 3 per cent, 2 per cent and 12 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (2 per cent, 6 per cent and 4 per cent fewer by 2004). The proposed Vivary Bridge ward would contain 4 per cent more electors per councillor than the average, improving to 1 per cent more by 2004. The proposed boundary between Horsfield and Waterside wards is illustrated on Map A3 at Appendix A, the proposed boundary between Waterside and Vivary Bridge wards is illustrated on Map A4 at Appendix A and the proposed boundary between Waterside and Marsden wards is illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of the report.

Electoral Cycle

77 At Stage One we received one representation regarding the Borough Council's electoral cycle. The Borough Council proposed the retention of elections by thirds. In our draft recommendations report, we therefore proposed no change to the current electoral cycle of elections by thirds for the borough.

78 At Stage Three we received no further comments regarding the electoral cycle, and we confirm our draft recommendation as final.

Conclusions

79 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our draft recommendations, we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations in their entirety.

80 We conclude that, in Pendle:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 51 to 49;
- there should be 20 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of 16 of the existing wards should be modified;
- the Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

81 Figure 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 and 2004 electorate figures.

Figure 4: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

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

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

Final Recommendation
 Pendle Borough Council should comprise 49 councillors serving 20 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and at Appendix A. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

Parish and Town Council Electoral Arrangements

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

84 The parish of Barrowford is currently served by 12 parish councillors, who represent four wards, Carr Hall, Newbridge, Central and Higherford, which are each represented by three parish councillors. In our draft recommendations report, we proposed that part of the existing Higherford parish ward should be combined with Blacko parish to form a new Blacko & Higherford borough ward. We proposed that the revised Higherford parish ward should be represented by two parish councillors and that the remainder of the current Higherford parish ward should be transferred to a revised Central parish ward, which should be represented by four parish councillors. We proposed no change to the existing Carr Hall and Newbridge parish wards.

85 In response to our draft recommendations report, the Borough Council supported our proposals in relation to this area, as did Councillor David (Fence ward) and a local resident. Blacko Parish Council and a local resident opposed the combining of part of Higherford parish ward with Blacko parish, and supported the existing warding arrangements. In addition, a local resident also opposed the combining of these two areas and supported the existing arrangements.

86 Having considered all the evidence received, we are confirming our draft recommendations for Blacko & Higherford and Barrowford wards as final, as previously discussed. In the light of the confirmation of our proposed borough warding arrangements, we are content to confirm our draft recommendation for revised warding arrangements of Barrowford parish as final.

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

87 Brierfield Town Council is currently represented by 13 town councillors and is divided into three parish wards. East and West parish wards currently form Brierfield borough ward, while South parish ward, together with Reedley Hallows parish, form Reedley borough ward. East and South wards are currently represented by five parish councillors, while West parish ward is represented by three parish councillors. As part of our draft recommendations, we proposed uniting the whole of Kings Causeway in a revised Reedley borough ward, in order to better reflect

community ties. We therefore proposed a consequential change to the boundary between South and East parish wards. At Stage One, Brierfield Town Council proposed no change to its existing parish arrangements.

88 In response to our draft recommendations, the Borough Council supported our proposals for this area. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for Reedley and Brierfield borough wards as final, as discussed previously.

89 In light of the confirmation of our proposed borough wards in the area, we are content to confirm our draft recommendation for the revised warding arrangements of Brierfield Town Council as final.

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

90 In our draft recommendations report we proposed that there should be no change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the borough, and are confirming this as final.

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

Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Pendle

6 NEXT STEPS

91 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Pendle and submitted our final recommendations to the Secretary of State, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992.

92 It now falls to the Secretary of State to decide whether to give effect to our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an order. Such an order will not be made before 17 October 2000.

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

The Secretary of State
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions
Local Government Sponsorship Division
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU

APPENDIX A

Final Recommendations for Pendle: Detailed Mapping

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

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

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

Map A3 illustrates the proposed boundaries for Horsfield and Waterside wards.

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

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

Map A1: Final Recommendations for Pendle: Key Map

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

Map A3: Proposed boundaries for Horsfield and Waterside wards

Map A4: Proposed boundary between Vivary Bridge and Waterside wards

