

Final recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements  
for Burnley 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 Burnley 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: 178

# 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>5</i>
3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>9</i>
4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION	<i>11</i>
5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>13</i>
6 NEXT STEPS	<i>29</i>
APPENDICES	
A Final Recommendations for Burnley: Detailed Mapping	<i>31</i>
B Draft Recommendations for Burnley (February 2000)	<i>35</i>

A large map illustrating the proposed ward boundaries for Burnley 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 Burnley 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 are confirming our draft recommendations as final, without modification. This report sets out our final recommendations for changes to electoral arrangements in Burnley.

We recommend that Burnley Borough Council should be served by 45 councillors representing 15 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 be elected 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 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

PROFESSOR MALCOLM GRANT  
Chairman



## SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of Burnley 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 Burnley:

- **in five of the 16 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and three 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 five wards and by more than 20 per cent in three wards.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 77-78) are that:

- **Burnley Borough Council should have 45 councillors, three fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 15 wards, instead of 16 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 14 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one, with two wards retaining 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 all of the proposed 15 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 15 wards expected to vary by no more than 8 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

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

- **new warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Hapton parish;**
- **an increase in parish councillors in Ightenhill parish from five to seven.**

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

Figure 1: The Commission's Final Recommendations: Summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>
1	Bank Hall	3	Bank Hall ward (part); Brunshaw ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part)
2	Briercliffe	3	<i>Unchanged</i> (including Briercliffe parish)
3	Brunshaw	3	Brunshaw ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part)
4	Cliviger with Worsthorne	3	Cliviger with Worsthorne ward (including the parishes of Cliviger and Worsthorne-with-Hurstwood); Brunshaw ward (part)
5	Coal Clough with Deerplay	3	Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (part - including the parishes of Dunnockshaw and Habergham Eaves); Rosehill ward (part)
6	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	3	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward; Bank Hall ward (part)
7	Gannow	3	Gawthorpe ward (part); Lowerhouse ward (part); Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward (part)
8	Gawthorpe	3	Gawthorpe ward (part); Hapton with Park ward (part)
9	Hapton with Park	3	Hapton with Park ward (part - including part of Hapton parish)
10	Lanehead	3	<i>Unchanged</i>
11	Queensgate	3	Queensgate ward; Bank Hall ward (part)
12	Rosegrove with Lowerhouse	3	Barclay ward (part); Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (part); Hapton with Park ward (part - part of Hapton parish); Lowerhouse ward (part)
13	Rosehill with Burnley Wood	3	Bank Hall ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part); Rosehill ward (part)
14	Trinity	3	Trinity ward; Bank Hall ward (part); Barclay ward (part); Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part)
15	Whittlefield with Ightenhill	3	Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward (part - including Ightenhill parish)

Note: 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 Burnley

	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	Bank Hall	3	4,381	1,460	-4	4,489	1,496	-5
2	Briercliffe	3	4,619	1,540	1	4,698	1,566	-1
3	Brunshaw	3	4,754	1,585	4	4,872	1,624	3
4	Cliviger with Worsthorne	3	4,468	1,489	-2	4,544	1,515	-4
5	Coal Clough with Deerplay	3	4,988	1,663	9	5,095	1,698	8
6	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	3	4,468	1,489	-2	4,543	1,514	-4
7	Gannow	3	4,533	1,511	-1	4,660	1,553	-1
8	Gawthorpe	3	4,596	1,532	1	4,802	1,601	2
9	Hapton with Park	3	4,178	1,393	-9	4,734	1,578	0
10	Lanehead	3	4,468	1,489	-2	4,544	1,515	-4
11	Queensgate	3	4,553	1,518	0	4,675	1,558	-1
12	Rosegrove with Lowerhouse	3	4,518	1,506	-1	4,740	1,580	0
13	Rosehill with Burnley Wood	3	4,728	1,576	3	4,808	1,603	2
14	Trinity	3	4,497	1,499	-2	4,731	1,577	0
15	Whittlefield with Ightenhill	3	4,784	1,595	5	4,947	1,649	5
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>68,533</b>	-	-	<b>70,882</b>	-	-
	<b>Averages</b>	-	-	<b>1,523</b>	-	-	<b>1,575</b>	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Burnley 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 Burnley in Lancashire on which we are now consulting. We have now reviewed the 12 districts in Lancashire (excluding Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool) as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. We expect to review the unitary authorities of Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool in 2001. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This was our first review of the electoral arrangements of Burnley. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in 1990 (Report No. 588). The electoral arrangements of Lancashire County Council were last reviewed in 1980 (Report No. 399). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements shortly after completion of the district reviews in order to enable orders to be made by the Secretary of State for the 2005 county elections.

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

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

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 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 then to achieve, so far as practicable, equality of representation across the district as a whole. For example, we will require particular justification for schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

8 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 district 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, or that changes should be made to the size of a borough council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other districts.

9 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, ie 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 are now being 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 that the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in our *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 Burnley Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Police Authority, the local authority associations, the Members of Parliament 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 Burnley 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 Burnley is situated in the east of Lancashire, and is bordered to the north by Pendle borough, to the west and south by the boroughs of Ribble Valley, Hyndburn and Rossendale and to the east by West Yorkshire. The borough has a population of some 91,130 and covers around 11,000 hectares, comprising Burnley town together with surrounding settlements. Historically the town has been an important manufacturing centre, particularly in the cotton industry. Although textiles are still manufactured, more recently manufacturing in the town has moved to include products for the aerospace and automotive industries. The town is served by the M65 motorway, while the Leeds & Liverpool canal runs through the borough.

14 The borough contains seven parishes, but much of the main urban centre of Burnley is unparished.

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 68,522 (February 1999). The Council presently has 48 members who are elected from 16 wards, each of which is represented by three members. The Council is elected by thirds.

17 Since the last electoral review there has been little change in the electorate in Burnley borough. At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,428 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,477 by the year 2004 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 five of the 16 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average, and in three wards by more than 20 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward where the councillor represents 33 per cent more electors than the borough average.

*Map 1: Existing Wards in Burnley*

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 Bank Hall	3	4,076	1,359	-5	4,176	1,392	-6
2 Barclay	3	3,252	1,084	-24	3,453	1,151	-22
3 Briercliffe	3	4,619	1,540	8	4,698	1,566	6
4 Brunshaw	3	4,031	1,344	-6	4,137	1,379	-7
5 Cliviger with Worsthorne	3	4,452	1,484	4	4,528	1,509	2
6 Coal Clough with Deerplay	3	4,281	1,427	0	4,378	1,459	-1
7 Daneshouse	3	4,167	1,389	-3	4,238	1,413	-4
8 Fulledege	3	3,717	1,239	-13	3,781	1,260	-15
9 Gawthorpe	3	4,566	1,522	7	4,772	1,591	8
10 Hapton with Park	3	5,013	1,671	17	5,585	1,862	26
11 Lanehead	3	4,468	1,489	4	4,544	1,515	3
12 Lowerhouse	3	4,362	1,454	2	4,488	1,496	1
13 Queensgate	3	4,115	1,372	-4	4,230	1,410	-5
14 Rosehill	3	4,313	1,438	1	4,387	1,462	-1
15 Trinity	3	3,376	1,125	-21	3,594	1,198	-19
16 Whittlefield with Ightenhill	3	5,714	1,905	33	5,893	1,964	33
<b>Totals</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>68,522</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>70,882</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,428</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,477</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Burnley 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 Barclay ward were relatively over-represented by 24 per cent, while electors in Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward were relatively under-represented by 33 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



### 3 DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

18 During Stage One we received five representations, including borough-wide schemes from Burnley Borough Council and a joint submission from the Independent and Conservative parties. 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 Burnley in Lancashire*.

19 Our draft recommendations were based on the Borough Council's proposals, which achieved substantial improvements in electoral equality, and provided a uniform pattern of three-member wards across the district. We modified the Borough Council's scheme in a number of minor instances affecting the proposed wards of Brunshaw, Cliviger with Worsthorne, Gannow and Whittlefield with Ightenhill (which would involve the transfer of a small number of electors) and affecting the proposed wards of Coal Clough with Deerplay, Rosegrove with Lowerhouse and Rosehill with Burnley Wood (which would not affect any electors). Our main draft recommendations were that:

- Burnley Borough Council should be served by 45 councillors, three fewer than at present, representing 15 wards, one fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 14 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward;
- there should be revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Hapton parish, and an increase in representation for Ightenhill Parish Council.

**Draft Recommendation**

Burnley Borough Council should comprise 45 councillors, serving 15 wards. The Council should continue to be elected by thirds.

20 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all of the 15 wards varying by no more than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, with no ward varying by more than 10 per cent from the average in 2004.



## 4 RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION

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

### **Burnley Borough Council**

22 The Borough Council supported the draft recommendations without objection, subject to proposing amendments to the boundaries between Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards and Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Trinity wards. It considered that its amendments would better reflect local community identities and would not have a detrimental impact on the overall levels of electoral equality achieved under our draft recommendations. The Borough Council also proposed the formation of a new Stonemoor Bottom parish ward of Hapton parish.

23 Under the Borough Council's proposed modifications, no ward would vary by more than 9 per cent from the borough average initially, improving to 8 per cent in 2004.

### **Other Representations**

24 We received three other representations during Stage Three, from two local councillors and a resident of the borough. Councillor Ali, member for Daneshouse ward, proposed transferring an area on the east side of Colne Road from Bank Hall ward to Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward. Councillor Ali considered that such a modification would better reflect local community identities and interests than the draft recommendations. Councillor Khan, also a member for Daneshouse ward, supported Councillor Ali's proposal. A resident of the borough wished to see a greater reduction in the number of councillors serving the borough than that proposed in the draft recommendations, and instead proposed a council size of either 39 or 42.



## 5 ANALYSIS AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

25 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Burnley 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”.

26 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.

27 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.

28 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**

29 At Stage One the Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 3 per cent from 68,522 to 70,882 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects the growth to be relatively evenly distributed, with the most noticeable increase in Hapton with Park ward (572 electors). The Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries was obtained. In our draft recommendations report, we accepted that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council’s figures, were content that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

30 We received no comments on the Council's electorate forecasts during Stage Three, and remain satisfied that they represent the best estimates available at present.

## **Council Size**

31 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government, although we are willing to look carefully at arguments why this might not be the case. Burnley Borough Council presently has 48 members. At Stage One, the Borough Council proposed reducing the existing council size to 45, in a uniform pattern of 15 three-member wards. The Independent and Conservative parties made a joint submission proposing a reduction in council size to 44, comprising 10 three-member wards and seven two-member wards.

32 In our draft recommendations report, we gave careful consideration to both proposals, but were not persuaded that the 44-member scheme would meet the objectives of this review better than the 45-member scheme submitted by the Council. In particular we noted that a council size of 45 would provide a good balance of representation between the parished and the unparished areas. Therefore, having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 45 members.

33 During Stage Three we received a representation from a local resident who proposed that the number of members representing Burnley borough should be reduced to either 39 or 42. However, in view of the absence of evidence of widespread support for such a proposal, and in the light of the general acceptance of our draft recommendation for a council size of 45, we are content to confirm our draft recommendation for council size as final.

## **Electoral Arrangements**

34 As set out in our draft recommendations report, we carefully considered the views which we received during Stage One, and in particular the borough-wide schemes received from the Borough Council and the joint submission from the Independents and Conservatives. We calculated that both schemes would secure improvements to electoral equality compared to the existing arrangements. However, we noted that the proposals put forward by the Borough Council would provide better electoral equality across the borough as a whole than those put forward by the Independents and Conservatives. In particular we noted that under the Independents' and Conservatives' proposal, two wards, Hapton with Park and Fullede with Burnley Wood, would retain substantial electoral imbalances in 2004.

35 With regard to the warding patterns put forward in the two borough-wide schemes, we noted that the Borough Council proposed a pattern of 15 three-member wards covering the borough

while the Independents and Conservatives proposed 10 three-member wards and seven two-member wards. Having carefully examined the two sets of proposals, we did not consider that there was sufficient evidence in terms of the statutory criteria to depart from the existing pattern of three-member wards or for a reduction to 44 rather than 45 councillors overall. Consequently, we concluded that we should base our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's scheme, as we considered that it would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the existing arrangements or the other proposals received during Stage One. However, we noted that in a number of areas the Borough Council had made proposals for minor modifications to external parish boundaries, largely to reflect ground detail, which we were unable to adopt, as we are unable to recommend changes to such boundaries as part of a periodic electoral review.

36 We have reviewed our draft recommendations in the light of the 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) Briercliffe, Cliviger with Worsthorne and Lanehead wards;
- (b) Bank Hall, Daneshouse and Queensgate wards;
- (c) Brunshaw, Fulfilledge and Rosehill wards;
- (d) Barclay, Coal Clough with Deerplay and Trinity wards;
- (e) Lowerhouse and Whittlefield with Ightenhill wards;
- (f) Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards.

37 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.

### **Briercliffe, Cliviger with Worsthorne and Lanehead wards**

38 These three wards are situated in the east of the borough. Briercliffe ward comprises the parish of Briercliffe together with a small unparished area in the west of the ward; Cliviger with Worsthorne ward comprises the parishes of Cliviger and Worsthorne-with-Hurstwood; and Lanehead ward is entirely unparished. The number of electors per councillor is 8 per cent above the borough average in Briercliffe ward (6 per cent in 2004), 4 per cent above in Cliviger with Worsthorne ward (2 per cent in 2004) and 4 per cent above in Lanehead ward (3 per cent in 2004).

39 At Stage One Burnley Borough Council proposed that these three wards should remain unchanged. Under a council size of 45, the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the borough average in Briercliffe ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 3 per cent below in Cliviger with Worsthorne ward (4 per cent below in 2004) and 2 per cent below in Lanehead ward (4 per cent below in 2004). The Independents and Conservatives also proposed that Briercliffe and Cliviger with Worsthorne wards should be retained on their existing boundaries. They proposed, however, that Lanehead ward should be modified to include an area in the north, east of the existing Bank Hall ward. Under the Independents' and Conservatives' scheme, which

only included electorate figures for 2004, the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the borough average in Briercliffe ward, 6 per cent below in Cliviger with Worsthorne ward and 9 per cent above in Lanehead ward.

40 In arriving at our draft recommendations, we gave careful consideration to the views which we received during Stage One. We noted that both schemes proposed that Briercliffe and Cliviger with Worsthorne wards should be retained on their existing boundaries. In the light of this consensus, together with the good electoral equality which would be achieved under a council size of 45 in the two wards concerned, we adopted the proposals for these wards as part of our draft recommendations, subject to two minor amendments to the boundary between Cliviger with Worsthorne ward and Brunshaw ward to better reflect ground detail. With regard to the proposals for Lanehead ward, we noted that, under a council size of 45, the Borough Council's proposals would achieve a better level of electoral equality, while retaining existing community ties and facilitating our proposals for the wider borough area. We therefore adopted the Borough Council's proposals for Lanehead ward as part of our draft recommendations.

41 At Stage Three we received no further representations relating to our proposals for the wards of Briercliffe, Cliviger with Worsthorne and Lanehead wards and we have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. Our final recommendations are shown on Map A2 and the large map at the back of this report.

### **Bank Hall, Daneshouse and Queensgate wards**

42 These three wards are situated in the centre and north of Burnley town and each is entirely unparished. Bank Hall ward contains most of Burnley's central commercial area. The number of electors per councillor is 5 per cent below the borough average in Bank Hall ward (6 per cent in 2004), 3 per cent below in Daneshouse ward (4 per cent in 2004) and 4 per cent below in Queensgate ward (5 per cent in 2004).

43 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed that Bank Hall ward should be modified to have a more easterly orientation. The Council proposed that the part of Bank Hall ward to the west of the A682 should be transferred to form part of Queensgate ward to the north, while the area to the south of the River Calder would form part of a new Rosehill with Burnley Wood ward. It proposed that Bank Hall ward should be further modified to include an area around Higgin Street, currently in Fulfilledge ward, together with an area on either side of Ormerod Road, currently in Brunshaw ward. The northern boundary of Bank Hall ward would be modified, transferring an area around Ivy Street to Queensgate ward. Under the Council's scheme there would be no further changes to the boundaries of Daneshouse and Queensgate wards, although the Council proposed that Daneshouse ward should be renamed Daneshouse with Stoneyholme.

44 Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be equal to the borough average in Bank Hall ward (1 per cent below in 2004), 3 per cent below in

Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward (5 per cent below in 2004) and equal to the borough average in Queensgate ward (1 per cent below in 2004).

45 The Independents and Conservatives proposed that the existing three-member Queensgate ward should be modified to incorporate an area in the north of the existing Bank Hall ward similar to that proposed by the Borough Council. They proposed that the existing three-member Daneshouse ward should be modified to include an area of Bank Hall ward around Pheasantford Street. The Independents and Conservatives also proposed that a revised two-member Trinity ward should comprise much of the existing ward together with an area in the south-west of the existing Bank Hall ward, containing most of the town's central commercial area. Under their proposals, which only included electorate figures for 2004, the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent above the borough average in Daneshouse ward, 1 per cent above in Queensgate ward and 8 per cent below in Trinity ward.

46 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the proposals which we had received in this area. In particular, we noted that the Borough Council's proposals would achieve a better level of electoral equality than those put forward by the Independents and Conservatives, while facilitating our proposals for the wider area and, we judged, providing a satisfactory reflection of the other statutory criteria. We therefore adopted the Borough Council's proposals for the wards of Bank Hall, Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Queensgate as part of our draft recommendations.

47 At Stage Three Burnley Borough Council proposed a modification to the boundary between Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Trinity wards. Specifically the Council proposed that the boundary should follow the existing boundary between Daneshouse and Trinity wards in the north, and that it should follow Queen's Lancashire Way and Manchester Road in the south. It considered that such a modification would better reflect local geography and community identity. Under such a proposal, the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the borough average in Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward (8 per cent below in 2004) and 2 per cent below the average in Trinity ward (equal to the average in 2004).

48 Councillor Ali, one of the members for Daneshouse ward, proposed that 188 electors in the Tennis Street area should be transferred from the proposed Bank Hall ward to Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward. He considered that such a modification would better reflect local community identities, as the electorate in the area concerned shared many community facilities with the proposed Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward. Councillor Khan, also a member for Daneshouse ward, supported this modification.

49 We have given careful consideration to the views which we have received in response to our draft recommendations. We note the Borough Council's proposal to amend the boundary between the proposed Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Trinity wards and, while we note that such an amendment would not achieve as good electoral equality as under the draft recommendations, we consider that the improved reflection of local community identities and geography which it

would provide outweighs other considerations. We are therefore adopting the Borough Council's proposed modification to the boundary between Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Trinity wards as part of our final recommendations. With regard to the amendment put forward by Councillor Ali, we consider that the alternative boundary would better reflect local community identities while also providing a more equitable distribution of the electorate. Consequently we are also adopting this modification as part of our final recommendations. We are confirming our draft recommendation for Queensgate ward as final, without modification.

50 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent below the borough average in Bank Hall ward (5 per cent in 2004), 2 per cent below the average in Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward (4 per cent in 2004) and equal to the average in Queensgate ward (1 per cent below in 2004).

### **Brunshaw, Fulledge and Rosehill wards**

51 Together these three wards form the south-eastern part of the central urban area of the borough and each is entirely unparished. The number of electors per councillor is 6 per cent below the borough average in Brunshaw ward (7 per cent below in 2004), 13 per cent below in Fulledge ward (15 per cent below in 2004) and 1 per cent above in Rosehill ward (1 per cent below in 2004).

52 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed that, in addition to the modification to the boundary of Fulledge ward, outlined above, the remainder of Fulledge ward should be divided between the existing Brunshaw ward and a new Rosehill with Burnley Wood ward. Specifically it proposed that Brunshaw ward should include that part of Fulledge ward which lies generally to the east of Mitella Street, while the remaining area which lies generally to the west of the River Calder would form part of a new Rosehill with Burnley Wood ward. The Council further proposed that the new Rosehill with Burnley Wood ward should include part of the existing Rosehill ward lying to the east of the Manchester Road, but also incorporating those properties on the eastern edge of Scott Park.

53 Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 4 per cent above the borough average in Brunshaw ward (3 per cent in 2004) and 3 per cent above in Rosehill with Burnley Wood ward (2 per cent in 2004).

54 In addition to the proposed modification to a three-member Brunshaw ward detailed earlier, the Independents and Conservatives included proposals for a new three-member Fulledge with Burnley Wood ward. The new ward would comprise the existing Fulledge ward, together with an area of the existing Bank Hall ward lying generally to the east of Centenary Way and an area of Rosehill ward situated generally to the east of Moseley Road and the railway line. The working paper sent to us by the Independents and Conservatives noted that electoral equality in Fulledge with Burnley Wood ward would be worse than in other wards, but stated that "there is a strong case for this exception due to the retention of community identities." Under these proposals, by

2004 the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent below the borough average in Brunshaw ward and 19 per cent above in Fullede with Burnley Wood ward.

55 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we received during Stage One. We were particularly concerned at the poor levels of electoral equality which would result under the proposals put forward by the Independents and Conservatives. While we noted the issues raised regarding community identities in the area, we did not consider that such levels of electoral inequality were justified in this case. Consequently we adopted the Borough Council's proposals in this area as part of our draft recommendations as we considered that they would secure substantial improvements to electoral equality, and, having visited the area, we judged that they satisfactorily reflected the statutory criteria while facilitating our proposals across the wider area. As noted above, we proposed minor amendments to the boundary between the wards of Brunshaw and Cliviger with Worsthorne.

56 At Stage Three we received no further representations relating to our proposals for the wards in this area and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for the wards of Brunshaw and Rosehill with Burnley Wood as final. Our final recommendations are shown on Map A2 and the large map at the back of this report.

### **Barclay, Coal Clough with Deerplay and Trinity wards**

57 The wards of Barclay, Coal Clough with Deerplay and Trinity are situated in the centre and south of the borough. Coal Clough with Deerplay ward comprises the parishes of Dunnockshaw and Habbergham Eaves together with an unparished area in the south of Burnley town, while Barclay and Trinity wards are unparished. The area covered by these wards is significantly over-represented: the number of electors per councillor is 24 per cent below the borough average in Barclay ward (22 per cent below in 2004), equal to the average in Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (1 per cent below in 2004) and 21 per cent below in Trinity ward (19 per cent below in 2004).

58 In order to address the current over-representation in Trinity ward, the Borough Council proposed that it should be expanded to include part of Barclay ward to the east of Cog Lane together with the Chicken Hill area of Coal Clough with Deerplay ward. It proposed that Coal Clough with Deerplay ward should be further modified to include an area which lies generally to the west of the Manchester Road, currently in Rosehill ward, while an area around Florence Avenue, currently in Coal Clough with Deerplay ward, would be combined with Barclay ward. The Council proposed that, in order to address the under-representation in Barclay ward, it should be further expanded to include part of Lowerhouse ward around Lowerhouse County Junior School and the Printers Fold area of Hapton with Park ward. It also proposed that Barclay ward should be renamed Rosegrove with Lowerhouse.

59 Under the Borough Council's proposals the average number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the borough average in Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (8 per cent above

in 2004), 1 per cent below the borough average in Rosegrove with Lowerhouse ward (equal to the average in 2004) and 5 per cent below the borough average in Trinity ward (3 per cent below in 2004).

60 The Independents and Conservatives proposed that, in addition to the modification to the three-member Rosehill ward, outlined above, the ward should be expanded to the west and south to take in areas of the existing Coal Clough with Deerplay ward. They proposed that a modified two-member Coal Clough with Deerplay ward should be further amended to include an area of Barclay ward around Paisley Street together with an area of Trinity ward around Richmond Street. They proposed that a modified two-member Barclay ward should incorporate an area of Trinity ward around Westway. Under the Independents' and Conservatives' proposals the average number of electors per councillor would be equal to the average in Barclay ward in 2004, 7 per cent above the average in Coal Clough with Deerplay ward and 3 per cent above in Rosehill ward.

61 In our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we received in this area. While we noted that both sets of proposals would secure substantial improvements to electoral equality, we were unable to have regard to any single area in isolation but had to consider the impact which any proposals would have upon the wider area. Consequently, we proposed adopting the Borough Council's proposals for the wards in this area, as we judged they would provide a satisfactory balance of the statutory criteria while facilitating the provision of a good borough-wide scheme.

62 At Stage Three the Borough Council proposed modifying the boundary between Daneshouse with Stoneyholme and Trinity wards, as discussed earlier. We received no further proposals for the wards of Coal Clough with Deerplay, Rosegrove with Lowerhouse and Trinity. Consequently, subject to the amendment to Trinity ward, outlined above, we are confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

63 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor would be 9 per cent above the borough average in Coalclough with Deerplay ward (8 per cent above in 2004), 1 per cent below the average in Rosegrove with Lowerhouse ward (equal to the average in 2004) and 2 per cent below in Trinity ward (equal to the average in 2004).

### **Lowerhouse and Whittlefield with Ightenhill wards**

64 These two wards are situated in the north of the borough. Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward comprises Ightenhill parish together with an unparished area to the south, while Lowerhouse ward is entirely unparished. The number of electors per councillor is 2 per cent above the borough average in Lowerhouse ward (1 per cent in 2004) and 33 per cent above the average in Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward both now and in 2004.

65 At Stage One the Borough Council proposed that the majority of the existing Lowerhouse ward should be combined with an area of Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward on either side of Ightenhill Park Lane to form a new Gannow ward. The Council also proposed that this ward should incorporate part of the existing Gawthorpe ward in the Poets Road area. It proposed no further amendments to Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward. Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent below the borough average in Gannow ward both now and in 2004 and 5 per cent above the borough average in Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward both now and in 2004.

66 The Independents and Conservatives proposed that Lowerhouse ward should be retained on its existing boundaries and with the existing level of representation. It proposed that the existing Whittlefield with Ightenhill ward should be divided into two along Tunnel Street, Ighten Road and Ightenhill Park Lane and then running generally north to the borough boundary, to form two new two-member wards of Ightenhill and Whittlefield. Under their proposals, which included electorate figures for 2004 only, the number of electors per councillor would be 6 per cent below the borough average in Ightenhill ward, 7 per cent below the borough average in Lowerhouse ward and 7 per cent below the borough average in Whittlefield ward. Additionally, Ightenhill Parish Council stated that it did not agree in principle with the Council's proposals.

67 Having considered the proposals put to us in this area at Stage One, we adopted the proposals put to us by the Borough Council as part of our draft recommendations, as we judged that they provided the best balance of the need to secure improvements to electoral equality while having regard to the other statutory criteria. We proposed a minor modification to the boundary between Gannow and Whittlefield with Ightenhill wards to ensure that the borough ward boundary reflects parish boundaries.

68 We received no further representations relating to our proposals for Gannow and Whittlefield with Ightenhill wards during Stage Three and we have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. Our final recommendations are shown on the large map at the back of this report.

### **Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards**

69 These two wards are situated in the west of the borough. Hapton with Park ward comprises Hapton parish together with an unparished area to the north, while Gawthorpe ward is entirely unparished. The number of electors per councillor is 7 per cent above the borough average in Gawthorpe ward (8 per cent in 2004) and 17 per cent above in Hapton with Park ward (26 per cent in 2004).

70 At Stage One, the Borough Council's proposals addressed the substantial under-representation in Hapton with Park ward by reconfiguring the wards in this area. Consequently it proposed amending the boundary between Hapton with Park and Lowerhouse wards, detailed above. The Council also proposed that an area in the north-east of Hapton with Park ward should

be transferred to Gawthorpe ward. It further proposed that the boundary between Gawthorpe ward and the new Gannow ward should be amended, as detailed above. Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 3 per cent above the borough average in Gawthorpe ward both now and in 2004 and 10 per cent below the borough average in Hapton with Park ward (2 per cent below in 2004).

71 The Independents and Conservatives proposed that Gawthorpe ward should be divided into two new two-member wards: Gawthorpe North, comprising the northern portion of the existing Gawthorpe ward, and Gawthorpe South, comprising the remainder of the existing Gawthorpe ward together with the Stonemoor Bottom area of Hapton with Park ward. They proposed that the remaining Hapton with Park ward should retain its existing representation. Under the Independents' and Conservatives' proposals, the number of electors per councillor would be 5 per cent below the borough average in Gawthorpe North ward in 2004, 1 per cent above in Gawthorpe South ward and 17 per cent below the average in Hapton with Park ward.

72 In arriving at our draft recommendations we gave careful consideration to the views which we have received in this area at Stage One. We were particularly concerned at the poor levels of electoral equality which would result in Hapton with Park ward under the Independents' and Conservatives' proposals. While, under the proposals put to us by the Borough Council, the number of electors per councillor would initially vary by 10 per cent from the borough average in Hapton with Park ward, we noted that this was forecast to improve to 2 per cent by 2004. Moreover, we considered that the Borough Council's modifications to Gawthorpe ward would have provided a satisfactory balance between the need to secure improvements to electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. We therefore adopted the Borough Council's proposals for Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards as part of our draft recommendations.

73 At Stage Three the Borough Council proposed two modifications to the boundary between Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards. First, it withdrew its Stage One proposal that a northern portion of Stonemoor Bottom housing estate should be transferred from Hapton with Park ward to Gawthorpe ward. Second, the Borough Council proposed that an area around Station Road, currently in Hapton with Park ward, should be transferred to Gawthorpe ward. It considered that these changes would more accurately reflect local community identities than under our draft recommendations, while providing acceptable electoral equality in the two wards concerned. Under the Borough Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor would be 1 per cent above the borough average in Gawthorpe ward (2 per cent in 2004) and 9 per cent below in Hapton with Park ward (equal to the average in 2004).

74 We have given careful consideration to the Borough Council's proposals for this area. In particular, we agree with the Council that its proposed modification retaining Stonemoor Bottom housing estate entirely in Hapton with Park ward would better reflect local community identities. Moreover, we consider that the proposed transfer of the Station Road area from Hapton with Park ward to Gawthorpe ward would also provide an acceptable reflection of the statutory criteria. We also note that these modifications would ensure that good electoral equality would be achieved

in both wards by 2004. Consequently, we are confirming our draft recommendations for Gawthorpe and Hapton with Park wards as final, subject to adopting the two amendments put forward by the Borough Council.

## **Electoral Cycle**

75 At Stage One we received no proposals for change to the present system of elections by thirds. Accordingly, we made no recommendation for change to the present system of elections.

76 At Stage Three no further comments were received to the contrary, and we confirm our draft recommendation as final.

## **Conclusions**

77 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided to endorse our draft recommendations, subject to adopting the four boundary amendments affecting the wards of Bank Hall, Daneshouse with Stoneyholme, Gawthorpe, Hapton with Park and Trinity resulting from comments which were received during Stage Three.

78 We conclude that, in Burnley:

- there should be a reduction in council size from 48 to 45;
- there should be 15 wards, one fewer than at present;
- the boundaries of 14 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward;
- elections should continue to be held by thirds.

79 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	48	45	48	45
Number of wards	16	15	16	15
Average number of electors per councillor	1,428	1,523	1,477	1,575
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	5	0	5	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	3	0	3	0

80 As Figure 4 shows, our final recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from five to none. This improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with no wards forecast to vary by more than 8 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the need for electoral equality, having regard to the statutory criteria.

#### **Final Recommendation**

Burnley Borough Council should comprise 45 councillors serving 15 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held by thirds.

### **Parish Council Electoral Arrangements**

81 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 district wards, it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, in our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential warding arrangements for Hapton parish and an amendment to the level of representation for Ightenhill Parish Council.

82 The parish of Hapton is served by nine councillors and is not currently warded. In its Stage One submission the Borough Council proposed a borough ward boundary amendment between

Hapton with Park ward and the ward to the east which would require warding Hapton with Park parish. As this proposal formed part of our draft recommendations, and in the absence of specific proposals from the Borough Council, we proposed that Hapton parish should be divided into two wards, Hapton and Printers Fold, represented by eight councillors and one councillor respectively. Hapton parish ward would form part of Hapton with Park ward while Printers Fold parish ward would form part of a proposed Rosegrove with Lowerhouse ward.

83 At Stage Three Burnley Borough Council supported the proposal to create a Printers Fold ward of Hapton parish and, in addition, proposed the creation of a Stonemoor Bottom parish ward in the north of the parish, which would be represented by one councillor. The Borough Council stated that such a re-warding of Hapton parish had the support of the Parish Council, and would also facilitate the possible future creation of Padiham Town Council. With regard to the proposed creation of the Town Council, the Borough Council stated that it intended to conduct its own review of parishing arrangements in the Padiham area after the completion of this PER with the intention of creating a Padiham parish. The Borough Council asked if the Commission would express a view on the appropriate size for such a Council and on the appropriate pattern of elections. We would, however, not wish to prejudge the outcome of any future review which the Borough Council may carry out and would emphasise that the recommendations at which the Borough Council arrived would be passed directly to the Secretary of State for the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions without the involvement of this Commission. However, having considered the Borough Council’s proposals, we are content to adopt its proposed re-warding of Hapton parish, which would create a Stonemoor Bottom parish ward, represented by one councillor.

**Final Recommendation**  
Hapton Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Hapton (returning seven councillors), Printers Fold (one) and Stonemoor Bottom (also one). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed borough ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on the large map in at the back of the report.

84 At Stage One the Borough Council informed us that Ightenhill Parish Council had requested an increase in the number of councillors serving the parish from five to seven, and the Council asked that such “a measure be introduced for elections held from 2002 onwards”. While the timing of implementation of any arrangements relating to this review is a matter for the Secretary of State alone, we were content to put forward the proposal to increase the number of members representing Ightenhill Parish Council from five to seven. We received no further views regarding Ightenhill Parish Council during Stage Three and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

**Final Recommendation**

Ightenhill Parish Council should have seven councillors, two more than at present, representing the parish as a whole.

85 In addition, at Stage One the Borough Council proposed several minor amendments to the external boundaries of a number of parishes so that they would follow ground detail, thereby reflecting the Council's borough warding proposals. However, as part of this review the Commission is unable to make recommendations for change to the external boundaries of parishes and consequently we did not include such modifications as part of our draft recommendations. We understand that the Borough Council proposes carrying out a review of parishing arrangements, as detailed above, and these issues could be considered as part of that review. At Stage Three, we received no further comments relating to the Council's proposals and are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

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

**Final Recommendation**

For parish councils, elections should continue to take place at the same time as for the principal authority.

*Map 2: The Commission's Final Recommendations for Burnley*



## 6 NEXT STEPS

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

88 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.

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

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



# APPENDIX A

## **Final Recommendations for Burnley: Detailed Mapping**

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the Burnley 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 Map A2 and the large map at the back of the report.

**Map A2** illustrates the proposed boundary between Brunshaw and Cliviger with Worsthorne wards.

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

*Map A1: Final Recommendations for Burnley: Key Map*

*Map A2: Proposed boundary between Brunshaw and Cliviger with Worsthorne wards*



## APPENDIX B

### Draft Recommendations for Burnley

Our final recommendations, detailed in Figures 1 and 2, differ in terms of electorate from those we put forward as draft recommendations in respect of a number of wards, where our draft proposals are set out below.

*Figure B1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Constituent Areas*

Ward name	Constituent areas
Bank Hall	Bank Hall ward (part); Brunshaw ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part)
Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme ward; Bank Hall ward (part)
Gawthorpe	Gawthorpe ward (part); Hapton with Park ward (part)
Hapton with Park	Hapton with Park ward (part - including part of Hapton parish)
Trinity	Trinity ward; Barclay ward (part); Coal Clough with Deerplay ward (part); Fulfilled ward (part)

*Figure B2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward*

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Bank Hall	3	4,569	1,523	0	4,677	1,559	-1
Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	3	4,435	1,478	-3	4,510	1,503	-5
Gawthorpe	3	4,684	1,561	3	4,890	1,630	3
Hapton with Park	3	4,090	1,363	-10	4,646	1,549	-2
Trinity	3	4,342	1,447	-5	4,576	1,525	-3

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

