

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Leeds

February 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	13
2 Current electoral arrangements	15
3 Submissions recieved	19
4 Analysis and draft recommendations	21
5 What happens next?	55
 Appendices	
A Draft recommendations for Leeds: key map	57
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	59

What is The Boundary Committee for England?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

Summary

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

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

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

- **in 17 of the 33 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city, and nine wards vary by more than 20% from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 16 wards and by more than 20% in 11 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 178-179) are that:

- **Leeds City Council should have 99 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 33 wards, the same as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified.**

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

- **In all but one of the proposed 33 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 8% from the city average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 8% from the average for the city in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements for the parish of Harewood;**
- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parish of Otley.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 11 February 2003. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, which will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**

- **The Electoral Commission will decide whether to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. It will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 7 April 2003:

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

Table 1: Draft recommendations: summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1	Alwoodley	3	Part of North ward; part of Roundhay ward; the proposed Wigton parish ward of Harewood parish	6
2	Ardsley & Robin Hood	3	Part of Middleton ward; part of Morley South ward; part of Rothwell ward	10
3	Armley	3	Armley ward; part of City & Holbeck ward; part of Wortley ward	6, 9 & 10
4	Beeston	3	Part of Beeston ward; part of City & Holbeck ward	10
5	Bramham & Harewood	3	The parishes of Aberford, Bardsey cum Rigton, Barwick in Elmet Scholes, Bramham cum Oglethorpe, Clifford, East Keswick, Lotherton cum Aberford, Parlington, Scarcroft, Shadwell, Thorner, and Wothersome; the proposed Harewood & Wike parish ward of Harewood parish; part of Barwick & Kippax ward; part of North ward; part of Wetherby ward; part of Whinmoor ward	3, 6, 7, 8, 11 & 12
6	Bramley	3	Part of Bramley ward; part of Pudsey North ward	2 & 9
7	Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	3	Part of Burmantofts ward; part of City & Holbeck ward; part of Richmond Hill ward; part of University ward	6 & 10
8	Calverley & Farsley	3	Part of Bramley ward; part of Pudsey North ward	2 & 9
9	Chapel Allerton	3	Chapel Allerton ward; part of Harehills ward; part of Headingley ward; part of Weetwood ward; part of University ward	6
10	City & Riverside	3	Part of Beeston ward; part of City & Holbeck ward; part of Hunslet ward; part of Kirkstall ward; part of Middleton ward; part of Richmond Hill ward; part of Rothwell ward; part of University ward	6 & 10
11	Cookridge & Wharfedale	3	Arthington parish; Bramhope parish; Pool parish; part of Cookridge ward; part of Otley & Wharfedale ward	2, 3 & 6
12	Cross Gates	3	Part of Halton ward; part of Whinmoor ward	6, 7 & 11
13	Farnley & Wortley	3	Part of City & Holbeck ward; part of Wortley ward	9 & 10
14	Garforth & Swillington	3	Austhorpe parish; Great & Little Preston parish; Swillington parish; part of Garforth & Swillington ward; part of Halton ward; part of Rothwell ward; part of Richmond Hill ward; Strutton Grange parish ward of Aberford & District parish	10 & 11
15	Gipton & Harehills	3	Part of Burmantofts ward; part of Harehills ward; part of University ward	6
16	Guisseley & Rawdon	3	Part of Aireborough ward; part of Otley & Wharfedale ward	1 & 2

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
17	Headingley	3	Part of Headingley ward	6
18	Horsforth	3	Horsforth parish; Horsforth ward; part of Cookridge ward; part of Otley & Wharfedale ward; part of Weetwood ward	2
19	Hyde Park	3	Part of City & Riverside ward; part of Headingley ward; part of Kirkstall ward; part of University ward	6
20	Kippax & Methley	3	Allerton Bywater parish; Ledsham parish; Ledston parish; Micklefield parish; part of Barwick & Kippax ward; part of Garforth & Swillington ward	11 & 12
21	Kirkstall	3	Part of Bramley ward; part of Kirkstall ward; part of Weetwood ward	2, 6 & 9
22	Middleton Park	3	Part of Hunslet ward; part of Middleton ward	10
23	Moortown	3	Part of Moortown ward; part of Weetwood ward	6
24	Morley North	3	Churwell and Scatcherd parish wards of Morley parish; part of Morley North ward	9 & 10
25	Morley South	3	Central, Topcliffe, Elmfield and Teale parish wards of Morley parish; part of Morley South ward; part of Morley North ward	9 & 10
26	Otley & Yeadon	3	Otley parish; Carlton parish; part of Aireborough ward; part of Otley & Wharfedale ward	1 & 2
27	Pudsey	3	Pudsey South ward; part of Bramley ward	9
28	Rothwell	3	Part of Hunslet ward; part of Middleton ward; part of Rothwell ward	10 & 11
29	Roundhay	3	Part of Moortown ward; part of Roundhay ward	6
30	Seacroft	3	Seacroft ward; part of Burmantofts ward; part of Harehills ward	6, 7 & 11
31	Temple Newsam	3	Part of Burmantofts ward; part of Halton ward; part of Richmond Hill ward	6, 10 & 11
32	Weetwood	3	Part of Cookridge ward; part of Weetwood ward	2 & 6
33	Wetherby	3	Boston Spa parish; Collingham parish; Thorpe Arch parish; Walton parish; Wetherby parish	4, 5, 7 & 8

Notes:

1) Only part of the city is parished, and 23 wards comprise the unparished areas.

2) The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.

We have made a number of minor boundary amendments to ensure that existing ward boundaries adhere to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Table 2: Draft recommendations for Leeds

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Alwoodley	3	17,086	5,695	5	17,331	5,777	4
2	Ardsley & Robin Hood	3	15,158	5,053	-7	16,401	5,467	-2
3	Armley	3	17,539	5,846	8	17,373	5,791	4
4	Beeston	3	16,265	5,422	0	16,141	5,380	-3
5	Bramham & Harewood	3	14,999	5,000	-8	15,350	5,117	-8
6	Bramley	3	16,042	5,347	-1	16,418	5,473	-1
7	Burmantofts & Richmond Hill	3	15,651	5,217	-4	15,686	5,229	-6
8	Calverley & Farsley	3	16,983	5,661	4	17,026	5,675	2
9	Chapel Allerton	3	15,546	5,515	2	16,937	5,646	2
10	City & Riverside	3	12,874	4,291	-21	15,574	5,191	-7
11	Cookridge & Wharfedale	3	16,084	5,361	-1	16,503	5,501	-1
12	Cross Gates	3	17,416	5,805	7	17,113	5,704	3
13	Farnley & Wortley	3	17,025	5,675	5	17,492	5,831	5
14	Garforth & Swillington	3	16,125	5,375	-1	16,271	5,424	-2
15	Gipton & Harehills	3	15,758	5,253	-3	15,684	5,228	-6
16	Guiseley & Rawdon	3	16,483	5,494	1	17,661	5,887	6
17	Headingley	3	16,494	5,498	1	16,669	5,556	0
18	Horsforth	3	17,294	5,765	6	17,411	5,804	5
19	Hyde Park	3	15,852	5,284	-3	16,633	5,544	0
20	Kippax & Methley	3	15,575	5,192	-4	16,421	5,474	-1
21	Kirkstall	3	16,503	5,501	1	16,493	5,498	-1
22	Middleton Park	3	16,817	5,606	3	16,964	5,655	2
23	Moortown	3	16,944	5,648	4	17,485	5,828	5
24	Morley North	3	16,705	5,568	3	17,830	5,943	7
25	Morley South	3	15,746	5,249	-3	16,337	5,446	-2
26	Otley & Yeadon	3	17,309	5,770	6	17,630	5,877	6
27	Pudsey	3	16,998	5,666	5	17,300	5,767	4
28	Rothwell	3	15,386	5,129	-5	15,863	5,288	-5

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
29	Roundhay	3	17,085	5,695	5	17,187	5,729	3
30	Seacroft	3	16,624	5,541	2	16,603	5,534	0
31	Temple Newsam	3	15,982	5,327	-2	15,939	5,313	-4
32	Weetwood	3	16,308	5,436	0	16,737	5,579	0
33	Wetherby	3	15,060	5,020	-7	15,337	5,112	-8
	Totals	99	536,716	-	-	549,800	-	-
	Averages	-	-	5,421	-	-	5,554	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on Leeds City Council's submission.*

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 city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

1 Introduction

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

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Leeds. Leeds' last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in August 1979 (Report no. 346).

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

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

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

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

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

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, or that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit on the number of councillors who can be returned from each metropolitan city ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan city wards currently return three councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

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

Table 3: Stages of the review

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

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

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

12 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 11 February 2003 and will end on 7 April 2003, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

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

2 Current electoral arrangements

14 The city of Leeds is the largest settlement in West Yorkshire. Its location is a key position for trade and manufacturing and has led to the city becoming a major commercial, industrial, administrative and cultural centre and focal point for road and rail communications. The manufacturing industry has declined as a source of employment in the Leeds area. However, Leeds has experienced a substantial development in the finance and business sectors, which are now the dominant industries within Leeds's economy. It is predominantly urban in character, but has a more rural hinterland, which contains such significantly populated areas as Guiseley, Otley and Yeadon in the north-west, Whetherby in the north-east, Morley and Rothwell in the south and Garforth, Kippax and Swillington in the south-east. The north and east of the more rural area is parished, containing 33 parishes, in contrast to the unparished city.

15 The electorate of the city is 536,716 (December 2001). The Council presently has 99 members who are elected from 33 wards, 22 of which are relatively urban and the remainder more rural. All wards are three-member wards.

16 At present each councillor represents an average of 5,421 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 5,554 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 17 of the 33 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average, in nine wards by more than 20% and in two wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Morley South ward where the councillor represents 36% more electors than the city average.

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

Map 1: Existing wards in Leeds

Table 4: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward	Number of councillors	Electorate 2001	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate 2006	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Aireborough	3	19,582	6,527	20	20,868	6,956	25
2	Armley	3	15,339	5,113	-6	15,279	5,093	-8
3	Barwick & Kippax	3	18,392	6,131	13	19,258	6,419	16
4	Beeston	3	11,990	3,997	-26	11,866	3,955	-29
5	Bramley	3	16,259	5,420	0	16,422	5,474	-1
6	Burmantofts	3	12,593	4,198	-23	12,916	4,305	-22
7	Chapel Allerton	3	14,524	4,841	-11	14,898	4,966	-11
8	City & Holbeck	3	14,853	4,951	-9	17,111	5,704	3
9	Cookridge	3	16,632	5,544	2	16,672	5,557	0
10	Garforth & Swillington	3	18,693	6,231	15	18,970	6,323	14
11	Halton	3	18,043	6,014	11	18,104	6,035	9
12	Harehills	3	13,732	4,577	-16	13,662	4,554	-18
13	Headingley	3	20,676	6,892	27	20,888	6,963	25
14	Horsforth	3	17,091	5,697	5	17,208	5,736	3
15	Hunslet	3	10,955	3,652	-33	11,449	3,816	-31
16	Kirkstall	3	15,217	5,072	-6	15,345	5,115	-8
17	Middleton	3	14,925	4,975	-8	16,092	5,364	-3
18	Moortown	3	16,151	5,384	-1	16,643	5,548	0
19	Morley North	3	19,370	6,457	19	20,542	6,847	23
20	Morley South	3	22,167	7,389	36	22,860	7,620	37
21	North	3	16,926	5,642	4	17,164	5,721	3
22	Otley & Wharfedale	3	19,053	6,351	17	19,544	6,515	17
23	Pudsey North	3	17,879	5,960	10	18,136	6,045	9
24	Pudsey South	3	16,893	5,631	4	17,195	5,732	3
25	Richmond Hill	3	12,057	4,019	-26	12,085	4,028	-27
26	Rothwell	3	16,223	5,408	0	16,703	5,568	0
27	Roundhay	3	16,624	5,541	2	16,808	5,603	1
28	Seacroft	3	11,772	3,924	-28	11,302	3,767	-32
29	University	3	15,536	5,179	-4	16,292	5,431	-2

Ward	Number of councillors	Electorate 2001	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate 2006	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
30 Weetwood	3	16,416	5,472	1	16,955	5,652	2
31 Wetherby	3	20,495	6,832	26	20,945	6,982	26
32 Whinmoor	3	12,614	4,205	-22	12,275	4,092	-26
33 Wortley	3	17,044	5,681	5	17,342	5,781	4
Totals	99	536,716	-	-	549,800	-	-
Averages	-	-	5,421	-	-	5,554	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Leeds City 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 city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Whinmoor ward were relatively over-represented by 22%, while electors in Wetherby ward were relatively under-represented by 26%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

3 Submissions received

18 At the start of the review members of the public and other interested parties were invited to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Leeds City Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

19 During this initial stage of the review, officers from The Boundary Committee visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 66 representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council, the Conservative Group, the Liberal Democrat Group, Beeston Community Forum and Mr Winfield, a local resident of Leeds, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council.

Leeds City Council

20 The City Council proposed a council of 99 members, the same as at present, representing 33 wards. The City Council stated that the scheme 'was developed over time during which there was a considerable amount of discussion and consultation'. This scheme provided for an improved level of electoral equality, with no ward varying by more than 10% from the city average by 2006.

The Liberal Democrat Group

21 The Liberal Democrat Group on the Council ('the Liberal Democrats') proposed to retain the current council size. The Liberal Democrats stated that their 'submission whilst similar in many respects to the Leeds City Council submission it differs in varying degrees in different parts of the city'. This scheme provided for an improved level of electoral equality, with only one ward varying by more than 9% from the city average by 2006.

The Conservative Group

22 The Conservative Group on the Council ('the Conservatives') submitted two city-wide schemes, their preferred proposal to reduce the council by three members and a proposal to retain the existing council size to reflect 'the fact that should 32 wards prove unacceptable [they] would otherwise effectively have no input into the process'. Both schemes provided for excellent levels of electoral variance, with no ward varying by more than 6% from the city average by 2006.

Beeston Community Forum

23 Beeston Community Forum ('the Forum') submitted two schemes proposing to either increase the Council to 120 members representing 40 wards or, their preferred proposal, to reduce the Council to 96 members representing 32 wards. The Forum's 96-member scheme provided for an excellent level of electoral equality, with no ward varying by more than 7% from the city average by 2006.

Mr Winfield

24 Mr Winfield proposed a council of 99 members, the same as at present, representing 33 wards. Mr Winfield's scheme would provide for an excellent level of electoral equality, with no ward varying by more than 5% from the city average by 2006, but it should be noted that under Mr Winfield's proposals, 'where polling districts are split, the number of electors in each component part is [an] estimate'.

Member of Parliament

25 Mr Colin Burgon MP (Elmet constituency) proposed an alternative arrangement to the City Council's proposals for the proposed Wetherby ward and commented on the proposed Bramham & Harewood, Kippax & Methley and Garforth & Swillington wards.

Parish and town councils

26 Representations were received from nine parish and town councils. Otley Town Council supported the City Council's proposed Otley & Yeadon ward and proposed amendments to its internal electoral arrangements. Aberford & District Parish Council opposed the City Council's proposal for its comprising parishes to comprise two city wards and proposed alternative arrangements for the proposed Kippax & Methley and Garforth & Swillington wards. The parish and town councils of Clifford, Collingham with Linton, Horsforth, Morley and Scarcroft commented on their internal electoral arrangements and made proposals for their respective areas. Micklefield Parish Council commented on the City Council's proposals in the south-east and north-west areas of Leeds and proposed a number of alternative proposals. Bramham Parish Council copied letters it had sent to councillors involved in developing a city-wide warding structure.

Other representations

27 A further 51 representations were received from a local political group, a city councillor, West Yorkshire Police Authority, local community groups and local residents.

28 Leeds Left Alliance proposed a radical restructuring of electoral arrangements for Leeds. The Alliance also proposed to amend the boundary between the existing Chapel Allerton and Moortown wards. Councillor Illingworth (Kirkstall ward) opposed the Conservatives' proposed Horsforth & South Kirkstall ward and commented on the progression and development of the City Council's proposed warding structure. The Police Authority argued that 'any changes should be kept to a minimum' to reflect that 'recent adjustments to the boundaries of Policing Divisions have attempted to follow ward boundaries and realignment with new boundaries would involve disruption for both residents and Police Officers'.

29 Kippax Community Environment Forum, North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association, East Park Community Association and Spenn Lane & West Park Residents' Association commented on their respective local areas. Two local residents made proposals for their respective local areas. We also received 41 submissions regarding the village of Scarcroft from local residents highlighting their concern that the village is divided between two city wards and currently in a ward with areas with which it shares little community identity.

4 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

Electorate forecasts

35 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 2% from 536,716 to 549,800 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in City & Holbeck ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Middleton ward. In order to prepare these forecasts, the City 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.

36 During Stage One North Hyde Park Neighbourhood Association highlighted its concern that within the existing Headingley ward a ‘transient and seasonal population [of students] is inevitably underestimated in the electoral register’. In light of the Association’s comments, we sought further clarification from the City Council as to the electoral data for this area. The City Council noted that ‘in Headingley ward itself, which has the largest student population, 12.5% of properties had no registered electors compared to 7.5% for Leeds as a whole’, but that ‘it is not possible to quantify student non-registration precisely, and it may be thought unlikely that non-registration will decrease over the boundary review period’. However, the City Council stated that the electoral ‘projections do take account of two sizable student housing developments in the Woodhouse area’, and therefore provide the best estimates that can be made for

Headingley ward. It should be noted that The Boundary Committee will take claims of under-representation into account for the purposes of five-year forecasts, but only where substantial evidence is provided, both of the existence of under-registration and of the steps that are already being taken to increase registration in a particular area.

37 We know that forecasting electorates is difficult and, having considered the City Council's figures and its further comments, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council size

38 During Stage One we received proposals for three different council sizes. The City Council, the Liberal Democrats and Mr Winfield proposed a council of 99 members. The Conservatives proposed two alternatives for a council of either 99 or 96 members, while Beeston Community Forum also proposed two alternatives for a council of either 120 or 96 members. Morley Town Council stated that it 'believes that Leeds City Council should retain 99 councillors in 33 wards'. However, we considered that we had not received sufficient evidence to enable an informed judgement as to the most appropriate council size for Leeds and therefore requested that each respondent who had submitted a city-wide scheme provide further evidence and argumentation in support of their proposed council sizes.

39 Leeds Left Alliance stated that it 'would have wished to submit proposals for a reduction in the number of councillors from 99 to 66, and for an increase in the number of wards from 33 to 66'. The Alliance argued for a comprehensive restructuring of the electoral arrangements for Leeds. It contended that 'the current total of 99 councillors is excessive, particularly in light of the revised management arrangements for Leeds MDC' which has had the effect that 'individual councillors have greatly diminished power and responsibility' and 'Leeds could save a large amount of money by reducing the number of councillors'. With regard to Leeds ward structure the Alliance argued that the current three-member wards are too large and that 'virtually no ward covers an area which has a genuine overall sense of identity and coherence' and contended that the wards are undemocratic as 'an elector cannot hold any individual councillor to account for shortcomings'. It also proposed a revised 'system of elections'. However, the Alliance recognised that we are unable to consider any of these proposals due to 'current legislation'. We would be able to consider the Alliance's proposal for a reduction in council size, but as its proposed council size is a component of the proposals for a comprehensive restructuring of Leeds electoral arrangements we judge that we are unable to consider the proposed council size in the context of this review due to the legislation under which PERs are conducted.

40 The Liberal Democrats argued that a reduction in the number of members 'would result in wards too large to be effectively represented by three members, or in some parts of the city too large geographically'. In a more detailed submission the Liberal Democrats argued that an increase in the councillor:elector ratio would hinder the creation of wards that were 'cohesive in terms of community and geography' and obstruct members' ability to effectively conduct their representative role or maintain relationships with their constituents. Mr Winfield submitted a similar perspective. He contended that due to the large size of the present city wards there is a risk of 'councillors becoming remote from their electorates', and therefore 'to reduce the number of wards risks exacerbating this situation'. He further argued that a 96 member council would not produce a warding structure that best reflects 'natural communities'.

41 The Liberal Democrats also contended that there is no capacity to decrease the size of the council due to the needs of its political management structure, which under the modernisation programme has 'vastly increased the workload of the many councillors who serve on the various boards and committees' in terms of their responsibilities and 'the number of posts that [they] are expected to fill'. Therefore the Liberal Democrats argue that as the modernisation process has 'increased the scale of councillors' responsibilities' a 'reduction in the number of

councillors would result in an unacceptable increase in workload, both in terms of ward based casework and within the corporate structure’.

42 Beeston Community Forum proposed two alternative council sizes to reflect the eight parliamentary constituencies in the area, concluding that ‘the number of wards should be divisible by eight’. The Forum noted that its proposal for a 120 member council ‘is a much more radical approach’, which would be justified on the grounds that it would enable councillors to represent smaller areas that would provide a better reflection of communities and therefore allow for members to be more accountable to ‘the individuals who elect them’. However, we note that the Forum’s proposal for a 96 member council representing 32 wards is its preferred scheme. It argued that ‘the recent adoption by Leeds City Council of the cabinet model of governance has significantly reduced the workload, power and influence of individual councillors’ and that this has been exacerbated by trends such as ‘arms length organisations’ and the use of the private sector for public service delivery. In contrast to the expectation that the modernisation programme would enhance members’ representation role, the Forum explained how, in its experience of the community involvement teams, councillors do not place a ‘high priority’ on developing their representational role or interacting with communities, which the new political management structure is intended to encourage.

43 The Conservatives proposed two alternative council sizes, their preferred proposal for 96 members and another for 99 members to reflect ‘the fact that should 32 wards prove unacceptable [they] would otherwise effectively have no input into the process’. In support of their proposed 96 member council they argued that reducing the present warding structure by one ward would account ‘for more than half of the city-wide electoral deficit’, would ‘leave the city with eight [parliamentary] seats all contained within the city’ and that ‘any reduction acknowledges the fact that post modernisation the role of councillors has changed with most councillors now involved in fewer committee meetings’.

44 In providing further evidence and argumentation in support of their scheme the Conservatives outlined the City Council’s internal political management structure by describing the executive and scrutiny boards and area committees and their respective competencies and areas of authority. The Conservatives explained that the area committee structure is under review, proposing to delegate responsibility from the council with the intention to ‘reconnect locally elected members with their communities and enhance the[ir] representative role’. In studying the numbers of councillors sitting on internal committees and external bodies the Conservatives concluded that ‘members’ involvement with committees represents something like a third of that prior to modernisation and by implication the attendance demands on councillors is significantly less than it used to be’.

45 The Conservatives discussed the review being conducted by the Independent Panel on Members’ Allowances and its report published in April 2002. They quoted the report as stating that the IPMA is ‘uneasy about the number of lead councillors receiving a Special Responsibility Allowance’. They concluded from this that ‘having conducted a thorough review, the IPMA are stating that in its view three years into modernisation, the basic structure of the council is about right with the exception of an excessive amount of lead members’. The Conservatives’ interpretation was that the report points ‘clearly to a limited amount of slack in the system’. They concluded that all these factors justify their proposal for a council of 96 members.

46 The City Council made a detailed examination of its political management structure, describing how the adoption of the Leader and Cabinet model in May 1999 has meant that ‘although members may have lost their traditional committee role in 1999, all members [have] continued to play a variety of demanding roles’. Non-cabinet members play key roles as members of: full council; scrutiny boards; the standards committee and regulatory panels; joint committees and external bodies; area management committees; and as ward representatives.

47 The City Council described how initially the Cabinet (termed the Executive Board) 'was comprised of eight members which was reduced to seven, but workload demands upon the [Executive] Board have now led to it being increased to 10 members'. The scrutiny boards were set up in May 2000 with three scrutiny boards each comprising ten members; however, in May 2001 'the boards were expanded to reflect increasing workloads'. Currently there are seven scrutiny boards of which six comprise nine members and one comprises 13 members. These scrutiny boards require 67 members in total, but 'in practice some [members] sit on two – hence 60 members in total actually sit on [the seven] scrutiny boards'. The standards committee and regulatory panels require 65 members, on which the City Council commented: 'in light of the size of the population served by the Council, the major development of the City, the number of major events hosted by the City and the number of Council employees, all these panels have a heavy workload'. The City Council has appointed 16 area committees and 'all members are appointed to one such committee'.

48 The City Council argued that the multiplicity and range of responsibilities and duties within 'this structure coupled with members' representational role places considerable demands on members'. The City Council judged that 'in light of the experience gained in operating a modernised structure since 1999.....these bodies are now at optimum size', therefore 'to reduce the number of members would be to risk its effectiveness' as members could become overburdened 'to the extent that both the political management and representative roles are put at risk'. The City Council also contended that to enable a composition that reflects the diversity of society and be open to all sections of it 'workloads must not become excessive as to exclude people serving as a councillor unless they are prepared to give up paid employment'.

49 A number of the respondents discussed the issue of parliamentary constituencies. The Conservatives and Beeston Community Forum proposed that the warding pattern for Leeds should reflect the number of parliamentary constituencies. However, we take no account of parliamentary constituencies in recommending patterns of ward boundaries.

50 We have carefully considered all the representations regarding council size that we have received during Stage One. We consider that the key difference between the various proposals concerns the effect the modernisation process has had on the City Council's capacity to secure effective and convenient local government.

51 Both the Conservatives and Beeston Community Forum judged that there is an excess capacity, which would enable a reduction in members, but still allow for the City Council to execute its functions and duties effectively. The Forum considered that the expectation for the modernisation programme to enable members to expand their representational role has not been realised in practice. However, we judge, that although their evidence of the practical application of members' representational role is significant, it may not reflect the experience of all the members of the City Council.

52 We judge that, although the Conservatives considered that as a result of the modernisation process councillors have a reduced role within the political management structure, they have not provided sufficient evidence to contend that councillors' workloads have decreased within the new political management structure. We have studied the IPMA's report which the Conservatives included as part of their further evidence. We note that the IPMA considered the City Council's appointed lead members in terms of determining their appropriate remuneration, and we are not convinced that this is sufficient evidence to justify the Conservatives' interpretation that this indicates 'slack in the system'.

53 We consider that both the Liberal Democrats and Mr Winfield could have described in more detail how members would be hindered in performing their representational role and maintaining relationships with their constituents if they represented larger wards. We consider that the Liberal Democrats could have provided more evidence regarding how the roles and demands of councillors have developed as a result of the modernisation process to fully justify their view

that the process has 'increased the workload of the many councillors who serve on the various boards and committees' and the 'scale of councillors' responsibilities'. We note the valuable evidence detailing a local councillor's working week, but we consider that it is not necessarily reflective of the whole City Council.

54 We judge that the City Council has made a detailed study of the requirements of governance under its new political structure and considered its experience of operating within the new structures to reach a balanced conclusion on the appropriate council size to secure effective and convenient local government for Leeds. We agree with the City Council that due to the modernisation programme members may have lost their traditional committee role, but as they still perform a variety of roles and functions the demands on councillors in Leeds have not diminished.

55 All the respondents have put forward good submissions, and we recognise the effort and work that has been required to produce them, particularly Beeston Community Forum's and Mr Winfield's in view of their restricted resources. We are also grateful for the co-operation we have received with our request for further evidence and argumentation. In conclusion we judge that the City Council has provided the most persuasive argumentation and evidence to support its proposed council size. Therefore, having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 99 members.

Electoral arrangements

56 We considered all the submissions received during Stage One. We note that there is a measure of consensus between the proposals submitted by the City Council and Liberal Democrat Group and a measure of consensus between the proposals submitted by the Conservative Group, Beeston Community Forum and Mr Winfield.

57 The Labour, the Conservative and the Liberal Democrat groups all developed their proposed warding structures independently. We consider that even though there was discussion between the groups during the process of developing each of the schemes, it was not conducted to reach a consensus. The Labour Group's proposed ward structure became the City Council's scheme, but it should be noted that the proposal was developed within the political group. As far as we understand, council officers became involved once the Labour Group's proposals were adopted as the City Council's scheme.

58 Beeston Community Forum approached the development of both of its schemes with the aim of reuniting 'the natural community of Beeston' which 'was artificially divided' during 'the last revision of the electoral ward boundaries'. The majority of the Forum's submission provides substantial evidence of the community identity and interests that exist within Beeston. We recognise the time and effort that has been put into producing their submission, especially considering the limited resources the Forum has access to. However, as their proposed schemes are based on different council sizes to the one we are adopting, it is difficult to consider the Forum's proposed wards as they are of different electorate sizes to those required under a council of 99 members and, therefore, would result in higher levels of electoral variance.

59 Mr Winfield provided a detailed textual account of his proposed warding structure. He also stated that his 'experience of undertaking this exercise has demonstrated clearly that the task of respecting local communities, whilst remaining within the statutory constraints on the numbers of electors is difficult, if not impossible'. We recognise the considerable work that Mr Winfield has put into producing a high-quality scheme, especially considering the limited resources he has had access to.

60 The Conservatives stated that their submission 'reflects a cohesive and sustainable set of proposals which also recognise the modernisation that local government has gone through'. As we propose to retain the existing council size we are unable to consider the Conservatives' proposed 32-ward pattern. However, the Conservatives also proposed a structure based on 33 wards so that their preferred ward structure could be considered along with the other proposals to retain the existing council size. Therefore when discussing the Conservatives' proposed warding patterns in the following section we are referring to their scheme for 33 wards.

61 The Liberal Democrats' proposals agree with the City Council's proposals in the majority of the City. They described how, in their view, as 'the Labour Group were not prepared to consider any of the larger scale differences between [the] two proposals' they decided that they had 'to make an independent submission'. Even so it should be noted that the Liberal Democrats also stated that 'some minor alterations proposed by [them] were incorporated into the Labour proposals'. The key differences between the Liberal Democrats' and the City Council's schemes are between their proposals for the existing wards of Burmantofts, Harehills, Seacroft and Whinmoor in the east of the City and the existing wards of Aireborough and Otley & Wharfedale in the north-west of Leeds.

62 In its submission the City Council provided evidence of the consultation it undertook in the form of presentations made by the Labour Group during Stage One to interested groups and individuals, parish and town councils and the local media. It also highlighted the fact that 'the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups indicated that they did not support the proposed scheme', but that the Leader of the Green Group indicated its support and the Independent councillor for Morley North ward 'expressed his support for the proposals so far as they affect his ward'. The City Council also provided 'a full set of background documentation' and noted that 'all representations made informed the progress of the formulation of the final submission'.

63 We judge that overall the City Council's proposed ward structure provides a better balance between the statutory criteria than the other city-wide schemes we have received. We consider that it maintains as far as possible a divide between the rural and urban areas, achieves a good level of electoral equality and provides for generally stronger boundaries. We note the consultation that was conducted and that support has been received for parts of the scheme. We also note the degree of consensus between the City Council and the Liberal Democrats on the appropriate ward structure for Leeds. We consider that the Liberal Democrats do not provide a better balance between the statutory criteria where they provide alternative arrangements to the City Council's. Their proposals for the north-west secure a higher level of electoral variance, while their proposals for the east of the city join rural with urban areas and breach identifiable boundaries.

64 In comparison to the City Council's scheme we judge that the Conservatives' scheme would not provide a better reflection of community identities in the south-west and would join rural and urban areas in the east of the city. We also consider, in comparison to the City Council's scheme, that Mr Winfield's proposed ward structure would not provide for a better reflection of community identities in the south-west area or provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria in one of the central areas of the city.

65 In view of the degree of consensus behind large elements of the Council's proposals, and the consultation exercise which it undertook with interested parties, we have based our recommendations on the City Council's scheme. We consider that this scheme would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. However, we propose to amend the City Council's proposed warding arrangements affecting 19 wards to provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria and to secure more identifiable boundaries. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) Barwick & Kippax, Garforth & Swillington, North and Wetherby wards;
- b) Middleton, Morley South, Morley North and Rothwell wards;
- c) Armley, Bramley, Pudsey South, Pudsey North and Wortley wards;
- d) Aireborough, Cookridge, Horsforth and Otley & Wharfedale wards;
- e) Kirkstall, Moortown, Roundhay and Weetwood wards;
- f) Halton, Seacroft and Whinmoor wards;
- g) Burmantofts, Chapel Allerton, Harehills, Headingley, Richmond Hill and University wards;
- h) Beeston, City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards.

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

Barwick & Kippax, Garforth & Swillington, North and Wetherby wards

67 These four wards comprise the more rural hinterland to the north, east and south-east of the city. Barwick & Kippax ward comprises the parishes of Scarcroft, Thorner, Aberford, Parlington, Lotherton cum Aberford, Sturton Grange, Micklefield, Ledsham, Ledston and Allerton Bywater, and Barwick parish ward of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish, and has 13% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (16% more by 2006). Garforth & Swillington ward comprises the parishes of Swillington and Great & Little Preston and has 15% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (14% more by 2006). North ward comprises the parish of Harewood and has 4% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (3% more by 2006). Wetherby ward comprises the parishes of Wetherby, Walton, Thorp Arch, Boston Spa, Collingham with Linton, Clifford, Bramham Cum Oglethorpe, Wothersome, Bardsey Cum Rigton and East Keswick and has 26% more electors per councillor than the city average both now and by 2006.

68 There is a measure of consensus between the four respondents who proposed city-wide schemes of 33 wards. They proposed a modified Wetherby ward to comprise the parishes of Wetherby, Thorp Arch, Clifford, Walton, Collingham and Boston Spa. The Conservatives proposed also to include Wothersome parish and the residential roads of Hillcrest, Wharfe Rein and Wharfe Bank within East Keswick parish, 'reflecting the reality that the electors live in Collingham itself'. Mr Winfield proposed to include Linton parish ward of Collingham parish and Bramham cum Oglethorpe parish.

69 All four proposed a similar Kippax & Methley ward by the areas within the existing Barwick & Kippax ward south of Micklefield parish. All four respondents proposed to extend the south-western boundary to include the populated areas of Mickletown and Methley with the parishes of Micklefield, Allerton Bywater, Ledston and Ledsham and the populated Kippax area. The Conservatives also proposed to include three of the four parishes that comprise Aberford & District Parish Council (Aberford, Parlington and Lotherton cum Aberford parishes) and argued that their proposals would provide for 'a more compact ward both easier to administer and represent as well as being more meaningful for those actually living there'. The Liberal Democrats proposed to include part of Lotherton cum Aberford parish within its proposed Kippax & Methley ward and argued that the proposed ward would be 'a more compact and cohesive ward consisting of similar and inter-relating communities'.

70 All four respondents proposed a similar Garforth & Swillington ward to comprise the populated Garforth area and the parishes of Great & Little Preston, Swillington and Sturton Grange (to reflect the 'significant new building immediately adjacent to the Garforth boundary'), and, as described above, all the respondents proposed that both Mickletown and Methley be transferred to comprise their proposed Kippax & Methley wards to achieve an improved level of electoral equality. The Conservatives and Mr Winfield proposed utilising the existing boundaries except for the inclusion of Sturton Grange parish and in the south to transfer Mickletown and Methley to their proposed Kippax & Methley wards by proposing that the boundary utilise the River Aire. However, the City Council proposed that the boundary utilise the M1 until it meets the

River Aire, which the boundary would then follow until the eastern boundary of Great & Little Preston parish, from where the boundary would follow the existing boundary until the A656, which it would follow until it intersects with the M1. The Liberal Democrats proposed to transfer Austhorpe parish from the existing Halton ward to comprise part of their proposed Garforth & Swillington ward and proposed to utilise the M1 as the northern boundary until it intersects with Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish's western boundary, which it would follow southwards to then follow Austhorpe parish's external boundary until it joins with the existing Garforth & Swillington ward's boundary, where it follows the rear of the properties on Barrowby Road, in order to propose a similar boundary as the Conservatives and Mr Winfield.

71 The City Council and Liberal Democrats proposed a new Alwoodley ward to comprise the unparished area of the existing North ward, and the area north of the Ring Road and west of Roundhay Park Lane comprising part of the existing Roundhay ward and the Meanwood Park Hospital development site comprising part of the existing Moortown ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed also to include an area north of Stonegate Road and east of the Leafield Estate comprising part of the existing Moortown ward to provide 'better electoral equality' and noted that 'it is unfortunate that the ward boundary could not be the Ring Road'. The City Council proposed a new Bramham & Harewood ward to comprise the parishes of Harewood, East Keswick, Bardsey cum Rigton, Scarcroft, Thorner, Barwick in Elmet and Scholes, Wothersome, Bramhope cum Oglethorpe, Shadwell, Aberford, Parlington and Lotherton cum Aberford. The Liberal Democrats proposed a similar ward, but proposed that only Barwick parish ward of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish and the parishes of Aberford and Parlington comprise their proposed Bramham & Harewood ward.

72 The Conservatives proposed a modified North ward by transferring a south-western area broadly south of Buck Stone Road, King Lane and Nursery Lane to their proposed Moortown ward, while also including the parishes of East Keswick and Bardsey cum Rigton. They proposed to name the ward North Rural to 'better reflect the new character and make-up of the ward'. They proposed that the parishes of Scarcroft and Thorner should comprise an enlarged Roundhay ward, to be named Roundhay & Thorner, 'to reflect the geographical enlargement of the ward', and for the parishes of Bramham cum Oglethorpe, Aberford and Barwick in Elmet and Scholes to comprise an enlarged Whinmoor ward to be named Barwick & Whinmoor ward.

73 Mr Winfield proposed to modify the existing North ward by transferring the south-western area broadly south of Deanswood Rise and west of Cranmer Bank and Saxon Grove to his proposed Moortown ward. He proposed a Barwick & Collingham ward, representing 'the two largest communities', to comprise Collingham parish ward of Collingham parish, the parishes of East Keswick, Bardsey cum Rigton, Scarcroft, Thorner, Barwick in Elmet and Scholes, Wothersome, Aberford, Parlington and Lotherton cum Aberford and the northern areas within the existing Whinmoor ward broadly east of the Ring Road and north of Naburn Approach.

74 Mr Colin Burgon MP proposed that Wetherby parish would be best linked with the parishes of Boston Spa, Clifford, Bramham Cum Oglethorpe 'and possibly Aberford with the A1 as the obvious spine of this new ward'. He argued that this would provide for a better reflection of communities' access to services and their interests. Mr Burgon highlighted his concern that the City Council's proposed Bramham & Harewood ward would lack coherence and would be geographically large. He proposed that the parishes of Collingham, Bardsey cum Rigton, East Keswick, Scarcroft and Shadwell 'could be best looked at as forming the base for another local government ward' as they 'share a commonality of interests and identification'. He also highlighted his support for the City Council's proposed Garforth & Swillington and Kippax & Methley wards. Leeds Left Alliance proposed that the existing North ward be retained as it provides for a good level of electoral equality.

75 Scarcroft Parish Council and 41 local residents stated their opposition to the existing arrangements as they do not provide a good reflection of community identities. The local residents and the Parish Council argued that the village of Scarcroft is divided between two city

wards, the existing Barwick & Kippax and Wetherby wards, but that it should be contained in a single city ward. They also argued that Scarcroft parish identified and shared community interests with the parishes that constitute the existing Wetherby ward (particularly the parishes of Bardsey cum Rigton and East Keswick) and the parishes of Thorner and Shadwell rather than the areas that comprise the existing Barwick & Kippax ward. The Parish Council also proposed a number of amendments to the City Council's proposals for this area. It proposed that Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish comprise part of the proposed Gross Gates ward and that the Red Hall and White Laith areas should comprise part of the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward to provide for a better reflection of community identities and interests.

76 Aberford & District Parish Council represents a grouping of four parishes: Sturton Grange, Aberford, Lotherton cum Aberford and Parlington. The Parish Council opposed the City Council's proposal for Struton Grange parish to form part of the proposed Garforth & Swillington ward, proposing instead that it remain in a single city ward with the other three comprising parishes to provide a greater degree of convenient and effective local government. It also proposed an alternative arrangement for the City Council's proposed Kippax & Methley and Garforth & Swillington wards, with a new ward comprising the populated Garforth area and the parishes of Aberford, Barwick in Elmet and Scholes and Micklefield and a new ward comprising the populated areas of Kippax, Methley and Mickleton and the parishes of Swillington, Allerton Bywater, Ledston, Ledsham and Great & Little Preston. The Parish Council argued that this alternative arrangement would provide for wards which are more geographically compact.

77 Collingham with Linton Parish Council argued that 'it is in the best interests of the district council and the parish council to retain Collingham with Linton Parish Council unchanged in the Wetherby ward'. Clifford Parish Council submitted its view that it 'is content with the current electoral arrangements in the area'. Bramham Parish Council opposed the City Council's proposal for the parish to be transferred from the existing Wetherby ward to comprise the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward and 'in particular to separate [the parish] from Clifford [parish]'.

78 Both Micklefield Parish Council and Kippax Community Environment Forum stated that the City Council's proposed boundary between the proposed Kippax & Methley ward and Garforth & Swillington ward 'has the unfortunate effect of excluding a number of houses south of the A63 from the Garforth & Swillington ward'. They argued that these houses would identify with the rest of Garforth to the north rather than with Kippax to the south. They both proposed that the boundary run south of the houses to provide for a better reflection of community identity. Micklefield Parish Council commented that 'the parishes of Thorner and Scarcroft as communities identify themselves and have stronger links with other communities in the north and north-east of the main urban area of Leeds' and that Barwick and Scholes parish wards of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish should be in the same ward. The Parish Council noted that under the City Council's proposal the River Aire would separate the communities of Methley and Mickleton from the rest of the proposed Kippax & Methley ward. It argued for this area to comprise a new ward incorporating the existing Rothwell ward to provide for a better reflection of community identity. It proposed consequential amendments to the western boundary of the City Council's proposed Rothwell ward and the northern boundary of the City Council's proposed Kippax & Methley ward. The Parish Council proposed to rename the City Council's Kippax & Methley ward Peckfield ward to better reflect its comprising area. The Parish Council noted that because the City Council's proposed Kippax & Methley, Garforth & Swillington and Bramham & Harewood wards utilise the M1 motorway as a boundary it would be necessary to create unviable parish wards as they would contain very few electors.

79 Having considered the representations we have received, we propose to broadly adopt the City Council's proposed Alwoodley, Bramham & Harewood and Wetherby wards as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that the City Council's approach in attempting to maintain, as far as possible, a separation between the rural and suburban areas provides for a warding pattern that would provide the best reflection of community identities. While we acknowledge

that the City Council's proposed Bramham & Harewood ward covers a large geographical area, we consider that this is justified due to the rural nature of the area the ward covers. In addition this warding pattern would reflect the views expressed to us by the local residents of the village of Scarcroft and the parishes of Scarcoft, Collingham and Barwick in Elmet and Scholes. However, we note that the City Council proposes to utilise the M1 as the southern boundary, necessitating the creation of unviable parish wards in the parishes of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes and Parlington, and therefore we propose that the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward's boundary follow the southern boundaries of these two parishes.

80 We have not been persuaded that the Liberal Democrats', the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals would provide for a better reflection of community identities. We judge that the best reflection of community identities is provided by the City Council's proposal for the parishes of Aberford, Bardsey cum Rigton, Barwick in Elmet and Scholes, Bramham cum Oglethorpe, East Keswick, Harewood, Lotherton cum Aberford, Parlington, Scarcroft, Shadwell, Thorner and Wothersome to comprise the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward. We judge that the areas broadly east of the Ring Road and north of Naburn Approach are similar in nature to the areas to the south and should form part of the same ward.

81 We consider the Conservatives' proposal that the residential roads of Hillcrest, Wharfe Rein and Wharfe Bank within East Keswick parish be transferred to comprise a ward with Collingham parish has merit. However, we judge that there are too few electors in the area to constitute a viable parish ward.

82 Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we have noted that the City Council's proposed Alwoodley ward would not provide for the best reflection of community identity in the area or use the most identifiable boundary. Therefore we propose to amend the City Council's proposed Alwoodley ward to utilise the existing boundary of the Ring Road. We are aware that the estates broadly south of Wigton Moor and east of Harrogate Road currently comprise part of the existing North ward. Therefore we propose that the properties surrounding Wigton Lane be transferred from the City Council's proposed Bramham & Harewood ward to comprise part of our proposed Alwoodley ward. This area comprises the southern area of Wigton parish ward of Harewood parish, and we propose to amend the parish ward's boundary to reflect our proposed city ward boundary. This amendment would have a significant impact on the level of electoral equality secured by the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward. Therefore we propose a consequential amendment to transfer Clifford parish from the proposed Wetherby ward to the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward, which would maintain the relationship between the parishes of Bramham cum Oglethorpe and Clifford. We consider that, although our proposed Bramham & Harewood and Wetherby wards provide for a poorer level of electoral equality than the City Council's proposals, on balance they provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria and secure stronger boundaries.

83 Having considered the representations we have received, we propose to broadly adopt the proposed Kippax & Methley and Garforth & Swillington wards submitted to us by the City Council, the Liberal Democrats, the Conservatives and Mr Winfield. We propose to adopt the Liberal Democrats' proposal for Austhorpe parish to comprise part of the proposed Garforth & Swillington ward and, subject to this amendment, we propose to adopt the identical proposed boundaries submitted by the Conservatives and Mr Winfield. The use of the M1 as a boundary has merit, but it would necessitate the creation of a number of unviable parish wards. We note Aberford & District Parish Council's opposition to Sturton Grange parish comprising part of the proposed Garforth & Swillington ward, but we consider that this provides a better reflection of community identity and interests than if the parish were to comprise part of the proposed Bramham & Harewood ward.

84 We have considered the other alternative proposals submitted to us, but we consider that we have not received sufficient evidence or argumentation to convince us that Mr Burgon MP's proposed Wetherby ward, or the warding patterns and boundary amendments proposed by

Aberford & District and Micklefield parish councils and Kippax Community Environment Forum would provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria. With regard to the proposal to amend the boundary that follows the A63, we judge that we have received insufficient evidence to persuade us that the amendment would provide a better reflection of community, but we would hope to receive more evidence concerning this proposal during Stage Three. We note Micklefield Parish Council's proposed alternative ward name; however, due to the level of consultation conducted on ward names we propose to adopt the proposed Kippax & Methley ward name.

85 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Alwoodley, Bramham & Harewood, Garforth & Swillington, Kippax & Methley and Wetherby wards would contain 5% more, 8% fewer, 1% fewer, 4% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (4% more, 8% fewer, 2% fewer, 1% fewer and 8% fewer by 2006).

Middleton, Morley South, Morley North and Rothwell wards

86 These four wards comprise the southern periphery of the city. Both Middleton and Rothwell wards are unparished and have 8% fewer and equal to the average of electors per councillor for the city currently (3% fewer and equal to the average by 2006). Morley South ward comprises Central, Elmfield and Topcliffe parish wards of Morley Town Council and has 36% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (37% more by 2006). Morley North comprises Churwell, Scatcherd and Teale parish wards of Morley Town Council and has 19% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (23% more by 2006).

87 There is a measure of consensus between all four respondents who proposed city-wide schemes for 33 wards in their proposals for the existing Rothwell ward. The Conservatives and Mr Winfield proposed to retain the existing Rothwell ward. The City Council proposed that the northern boundary utilise the M1 and the River Aire and therefore proposed that an area broadly north of the football ground at Middleton Lane, which comprises part of the existing Middleton ward, and for an area south of the M1 and broadly north of Wood Lane, which comprises part of the current Hunslet ward, be included in a modified Rothwell ward; that two areas north of the M1 comprise its proposed City & Riverside and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill wards; and that two areas east of the River Aire comprise its proposed Garforth & Swillington ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed utilising the existing boundaries, but proposed a minor amendment for the boundary to follow the M1, thereby transferring an area north of the M1 to comprise their proposed City & Riverside ward, to provide for a more identifiable boundary.

88 The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed a new Middleton Park ward comprising a northern area of the existing Middleton ward. They proposed utilising the existing Middleton ward's north and west boundaries, but suggested that the ward boundary then depart from the railway line south of Thorpe Lane to follow the rear of properties on Thorpe Lane and Throstle Terrace and then follow pathways north of Throstle Carr to join and run along Sharpe House Road and then Sharpe Lane to join and follow the M1 northwards. They proposed that the areas north and west of this proposed boundary combine with the areas broadly south and west of the A621 and east of Middleton railway line within the existing Hunslet ward to comprise their proposed Middleton Park ward.

89 The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed that the southern area of the existing Middleton ward combine with an area broadly east of Dewsbury Road comprising the existing Morley South ward to comprise a new ward, proposing that it be named Ardsley & Robin Hood or Ardsley & Lofthouse ward respectively. The Liberal Democrats proposed utilising Dewsbury Road as the western boundary, dividing their proposed Morley South and Ardsley & Lofthouse wards, from where it intersects with West Wood Road to the city's external boundary and retain the existing boundary between Morley South and Rothwell wards as the eastern boundary. The City Council proposed that the ward boundary depart from Dewsbury Road to broadly follow the rear of the properties of Hesketh Road, Ryedale Way and Lonsdale Rise and then Westerton

Road and Haigh Moor Road, but then follow pathways from Jude's Pond through Haigh Wood to join and follow Baghill Road and Hay Beck Lane. The City Council proposed that the areas broadly east of this proposed boundary comprise part of its proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood ward and the areas broadly west of this proposed boundary comprise part of its proposed Morley South ward. The City Council also proposed transferring an area broadly west of The Shutts and north of West Beck from the existing Rothwell ward in order to contain the whole of the Robin Hood area within its proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood ward.

90 The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed similar Morley North and Morley South wards, based mostly on the existing wards, by proposing a new division between these two wards. They proposed that these two wards should be divided by the existing parish ward boundaries of Morley Town Council, proposing that Churwell and Scatcherd parish wards comprise part of the proposed Morley North ward and that Topcliffe, Central, Elmfield and Teale parish wards comprise part of the proposed Morley South ward. However, their proposed boundaries diverge after linking with the M621: the City Council proposed using Nepshaw Lane South and then following the A650 and the A62, while the Liberal Democrats proposed using the M621 and then ground detail to the external city boundary, which would necessitate warding Morley Town Council. As described above, the Liberal Democrats proposed that their proposed Morley South ward's eastern boundary utilise the Dewsbury Road and argued that the proposed ward would be 'a cohesive and recognisable grouping of communities'. The City Council proposed that the boundary depart from Dewsbury Road as described above.

91 The Conservatives proposed a reconfiguration of the existing Morley South and Middleton wards. They proposed to split the existing Middleton ward to enable an area broadly north of Middleton Park Ring Road and the Cranmore Estate to comprise part of their Hunslet & Belle Isle ward. They proposed to split the existing Morley South ward into east and west regions. They proposed that the eastern region of the existing Morley South ward broadly east of Thorpe Lane, Spink Well Lane, Smithy Lane, Hollerton Lane, Ardsley Reservoir and Bottoms Wood combine with the southern area of the existing Middleton Park ward broadly south of Middleton Park Ring Road and the Cranmore Estate and an area of Topcliffe parish ward (of Morley Town Council) broadly north of Topcliffe Beck and east of Albert Road, Bantam Grove Lane and Watering Lane to comprise their proposed Middleton & East Ardsley ward. They proposed that the western region of the existing Morley South ward and the areas south of Topcliffe Beck and west of Albert Road, Bantam Grove Lane and Watering Lane comprise their proposed Morley ward. The Conservatives proposed broadly retaining the existing Morley North ward, but transferring Churwell parish ward of Morley Town Council to comprise part of their proposed Beeston ward. They proposed to name their modified Morley North ward Gildersome & Drighlington ward to better reflect its constituent areas.

92 Mr Winfield's proposals for the existing Middleton and Morley South wards were similar to the Conservatives', while his proposal for the existing Morley North ward was identical except for the proposal to retain the Morley North name. He proposed to split the existing Middleton ward so that an area south of Bodmin Crescent, Middleton Park Ring Road, Sharp House Lane and Sharp Lane could combine with an eastern region of the existing Morley South ward similar to the one the Conservatives proposed, except to include the Haigh Moor area, to comprise a new Middleton & East Ardsley ward. He proposed that the remaining area comprise a modified Morley South ward.

93 Morley Town Council proposed broadly retaining the existing Morley North ward, but transferring Teale parish ward to a modified Morley South ward. The Town Council proposed that Morley South ward also comprise the remaining parish wards and the areas west of Dewsbury Road. It proposed a new Ardsley & Lofthouse ward to comprise the area of the existing Morley South ward east of the A653 and the areas broadly east of the M621 and south of Throstle Terrace comprising the existing Middleton ward. The Town Council argued that these three wards would secure a good level of electoral equality, utilise the existing town wards and recognise the community identities and interests in the area. It also stated its opposition to

proposals for Churwell parish ward to be separated from the rest of the Town Council at city level.

94 We have carefully considered all the submissions received for this area and propose to broadly adopt the proposals that the City Council submitted to us as part of our draft recommendations. We note that the Liberal Democrats submitted similar proposals for this area. In addition we note that this warding arrangement would reflect the proposals submitted to us by Morley Town Council. We note that there is a measure of consensus between the City Council, the Liberal Democrats, the Conservatives and Mr Winfield in their proposals for the existing Rothwell ward. However, we judge that the City Council's proposals provide for the most identifiable boundaries and we concur with its proposal for the whole of the Robin Hood area to be contained in a single city ward.

95 Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we are not convinced that the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals to split the Middleton Park area between two wards provides a better balance between the statutory criteria than the Liberal Democrats' and the City Council's proposals to unite this area with Belle Isle, utilising strong boundaries, to comprise their proposed Middleton Park ward. We note that there is a similarity between all the proposals for a new ward comprising the Ardsley area. We have been persuaded that the City Council's proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood ward would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria for this area, and due to the level of consultation conducted on ward names we propose to adopt this name. However, we propose two minor boundary amendments so that the whole of Ouzlewell Green is contained wholly in the proposed ward, and to follow Baghill Beck and ground detail to provide for a more identifiable boundary in the Upper Green area.

96 We were not convinced that the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals for the Morley area would secure a better balance between the statutory criteria than the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' similar Morley North and Morley South wards. We consider that the transfer of Churwell parish ward of Morley Town Council to comprise a new Beeston ward would not provide a good reflection of community identity. We consider that the City Council's proposed boundary dividing the proposed Morley North and Morley South wards would provide the most identifiable boundary and avoid the consequential parish warding arrangements required by the Liberal Democrats' proposal.

97 When considering the proposed warding arrangements submitted to us by the City Council and the Liberal Democrats we considered a number of amendments which might have improved the balance between the statutory criteria secured by the proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood, Middleton Park, Morley North and Morley South wards. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that the properties north of Middleton Lane proposed to comprise part of the proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood ward shared their identity with the areas comprising the proposed Middleton Park ward. We were concerned that the proposed Morley North ward would be under-represented, while the proposed Morley South ward would be over-represented. Therefore we considered an alternative option for the area north of Middleton Lane to comprise part of the proposed Middleton Park ward, for the area east of Dewsbury Road to comprise part of the proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood ward, and for an area north of Station Road and east of Church Street to comprise part of the proposed Morley South ward. However, having carefully considered this alternative option we decided that we do not have sufficient evidence or justification to propose such a comprehensive transformation of the proposals submitted to us by the Council and the Liberal Democrats, but we would welcome comments regarding this alternative option during Stage Three.

98 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood, Middleton Park, Morley North, Morley South and Rothwell wards would have 7% fewer, 3% more, 3% more, 3% fewer and 5% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (2% fewer, 2% more, 7% more, 2% fewer and 5% fewer by 2006).

Armley, Bramley, Pudsey South, Pudsey North and Wortley wards

99 These five unparished wards comprise the western periphery of the city. Armley, Bramley, Pudsey South, Pudsey North and Wortley wards have 6% fewer, equal to, 4% more, 10% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (8% fewer, 1% fewer, 3% more, 9% more and 4% more by 2006).

100 There is a measure of consensus between all four respondents who proposed city-wide schemes for 33 wards in their proposals for the existing Wortley ward. Mr Winfield and the Conservatives proposed retaining the existing ward, while the City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed to include an area broadly north of the railway line adjacent to Whithall Road and west of the railway line adjacent to Wortley Recreation Ground within the existing City & Holbeck ward, but to transfer an area comprising the existing Wortley ward to their proposed Armley ward. The City Council defined this area as north of the back of properties on Heights Way and Heights Walk and north of Whingate Road, while the Liberal Democrats defined this area as east of Congress Mount and north of Whingate Road. The City Council proposed to rename the existing Wortley ward Farnley & Wortley ward.

101 All four respondents proposed to broadly retain the existing Pudsey North, Pudsey South and Bramley wards, subject to differing amendments. The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed only minor revisions to the existing Bramley and Pudsey North wards. They both proposed to retain the existing Pudsey South ward and for an area broadly south of Bagley Beck and east of Bagley Lane to be transferred from the current Pudsey North ward to their proposed Bramley ward. The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed to broadly retain the existing Bramley ward; however, the Liberal Democrats proposed to retain Bramley ward's existing eastern boundary where it follows the River Aire, but the City Council proposed that the boundary should depart from the river to follow the Leeds to Liverpool Canal and then follow the western side of the Kirkstall Brewery site in order that the site be transferred to comprise part of its proposed Kirkstall ward. The City Council proposed to rename Pudsey South ward Pudsey ward and Pudsey North ward Calverley & Farsley ward. The City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed to retain the existing Armley ward, but proposed to transfer an area broadly north of Wellington Road and west of Canal Street from the existing City & Holbeck ward to comprise part of the southern area of their modified Armley ward.

102 The Conservatives proposed to revise the existing Pudsey North, Pudsey South and Bramley wards. They proposed to transfer an area broadly between the railway line in the north, Stanningley Bypass in the south, Owlcotes Shopping Centre in the west and Swinnow Lane in the east, and the area north of Cemetery Road, east of Lodge Road and west of Richardshaw Lane from the current Pudsey North ward to comprise part of their proposed Pudsey South ward, arguing that this would reunite 'a traditional part of Pudsey with the core area of Pudsey itself'. They proposed transferring an area broadly east of Swinnow Drive and north of Harley Rise and Swinnow Road from the existing Pudsey South ward to comprise part of their proposed Bramley ward, contending that 'this area was traditionally part of Bramley'. They also proposed for an area broadly south of Rosefield Drive and Railsfield Rise, north of Stanningley Road and west of Lower Town Street to be transferred from the existing Bramley ward and united with the existing Armley ward to form a modified Armley ward.

103 Mr Winfield proposed a number of amendments to the existing Pudsey North, Pudsey South and Bramley wards. He proposed the same amendments as the Conservatives proposed for these three wards, but also proposed additional amendments. He proposed to transfer an area broadly south of the Bradford Road and an area broadly east of Owlcotes Gardens and Owlcotes Lane from the existing Pudsey North ward to comprise a revised Pudsey South ward 'to reunite the core areas of Pudsey in Pudsey South ward'. He proposed for an area broadly east of Harley Drive and Valley Mount, and north of Hough Side Lane and Farnley Beck, to be

transferred from the existing Pudsey South Ward to comprise his proposed Bramley ward as the areas 'have some affinity'. Mr Winfield proposed that an area broadly east of Hough Lane, Ferncliffe Road and Westover Road and west of Upper Town Street be transferred from the existing Bramley ward and united with the existing Armley ward to comprise a modified Armley ward.

104 Officers of the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that the proposals for these five wards would entail uniting areas and communities either side of major geographical features, such as the railway line and the A647. When proposing new warding arrangements we seek to use the most identifiable boundaries, and therefore we considered alternative options to try to utilise these geographical features. However, in order to achieve good levels of electoral equality, and in doing so provide the best balance between the statutory criteria, it is sometimes necessary to breach major geographical features. With this in mind we propose to broadly adopt the proposals submitted to us by the City Council for this area. We note that the Liberal Democrats submitted similar proposals for this area. Due to the consultation conducted regarding ward names we propose naming these wards as Armley, Bramley, Calverley & Farsley, Pudsey and Farnley & Wortley wards as part of our draft recommendations.

105 We judge that the warding arrangements proposed by Mr Winfield and the Conservatives for the existing Bramley, Pudsey North and Pudsey South wards would not provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria in comparison to the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposals, particularly with regard to the proposal for an area comprising the north-eastern part of the existing Pudsey South ward to comprise part of the proposed Bramley ward.

106 Officers of the Committee having visited the area, we judge that although the City Council and the Liberal Democrats propose to transfer an area south of the railway line from the existing Wortley ward this is justified in that it allows for an isolated area surrounding Wortley Recreation Ground to comprise part of the proposed Farnley & Wortley ward and still provide for a good balance between the statutory criteria. We judge that the City Council's and the Liberal Democrats' proposals to transfer an area comprising part of the existing Pudsey North ward to comprise part of their proposed Bramley ward, and to transfer an area comprising the existing City & Holbeck ward to comprise part of their proposed Armley ward, would provide an appropriate balance between the statutory criteria and would secure identifiable boundaries. However, we propose two minor boundary amendments to secure a more identifiable boundary and a better reflection of community identities: for the area south of the railway line between Swinnow Lane and Swinnow Road to comprise part of the proposed Pudsey ward, and for the area south of Town Street and west of Grangefield Road to comprise part of the proposed Bramley ward.

107 Under our draft recommendations the proposed Armley, Bramley, Calverley & Farsley, Farnley & Wortley and Pudsey wards would have 8% more, 1% fewer, 4% more, 5% more and 5% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (4% more, 1% fewer, 2% more, 5% more and 4% more by 2006).

Aireborough, Cookridge, Horsforth and Otley & Wharfedale wards

108 These four wards comprise the north-western periphery of the city. Both Aireborough and Cookridge wards are unparished and have 20% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (25% more than and equal to the average by 2006). Horsforth ward comprises Horsforth Town Council and has 5% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (3% more by 2006). Otley & Wharfedale ward comprises the parishes of Otley, Pool, Arthington, Bramhope and Carlton and has 17% more electors per councillor than the city average both now and by 2006.

109 The City Council and Liberal Democrats both proposed broadly retaining the existing Horsforth ward. The City Council proposed to amend the boundary to depart from the existing boundary along Leeds Road to follow Over Lane and return to the existing boundary; and they both propose a boundary amendment for the eastern boundary to follow the railway line until the Ring Road, where it would rejoin the existing boundary of Oil Mill Beck.

110 The City Council proposed a further three wards. It proposed a revised Aireborough ward, to be named Guiseley & Rawdon ward. It proposed to amend the eastern boundary of this ward to run from the south-western boundary of Carlton parish, following the rear of the properties on the eastern side of Coppice Wood Avenue until it joins and runs along Banksfield Mount, turning to run along Coppice Wood Avenue, briefly following Queensway and then turning to follow Swincar Avenue, then Walker Row through the Westfield industrial estate to the western edge of Engine Field nature reserve and onto Parkland View and then Henshaw Lane, behind the properties of Henshaw Avenue and Cricketers Green, joining and following Green Lane and then Belmont's Grove and ground detail to link with the City Council's proposed Horsforth ward where the existing boundary intersects with Bayton Lane.

111 The City Council proposed that the areas east of this boundary within the current Aireborough ward should join with the parishes of Otley and Carlton, and the areas south of Carlton parish, which comprise the south-west area of the existing Otley & Wharfedale ward, to comprise a new Otley & Yeadon ward. The City Council proposed a new Cookridge & Wharfedale ward to comprise the majority of the existing Cookridge ward, except for the areas broadly south of Tinshill Road and Farrar Lane, and west of Otley Old Road, Raynell Drive and New Adel Lane, and the parishes of Bramhope, Pool and Arthington.

112 The Liberal Democrats argued that the communities of the Wharfe Valley, the parishes of Otley, Pool and Arthington, should be contained in a single city ward as 'it is probably the single most cohesive geographical area within the district boundary and the communities have a long tradition of inter-dependence and association'. To achieve this aim the Liberal Democrats proposed three new wards. They proposed a Yeadon & Rawdon ward, aiming 'to reunite these communities in a single ward', by amending the current Aireborough ward's north-eastern boundary to follow the A65 from the city's external boundary, along Otley Road, Leeds Road and New Road, then cross the open land of Nunroyd Park to follow Queensway heading east to join and follow Coppice Wood Avenue and then run along Banksfield Mount and join with Carlton parish's south-western boundary. They also proposed to amend the existing Aireborough ward's south-eastern boundary by departing from the existing boundary at the north-eastern part of Yeadon Tarn across an undefined area south of Leeds and Bradford Airport and to follow ground detail to join with the existing Horsforth ward's northern boundary where it intersects with Bayton Lane. They noted that their proposed Yeadon & Rawdon ward would have a high level of electoral imbalance, both initially and by 2006 (12% and 17%). However, they argued that 'this is justifiable when taking into account the benefits of producing such a cohesive entity'.

113 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the area of Guiseley, comprising part of the existing Aireborough ward, north and east of their proposed Yeadon & Rawdon ward's northern boundary, which follows the A65, Otley Road, Leeds Road and New Road, comprise the south-western area of a modified Otley & Wharfedale ward, arguing that this area of Guiseley is 'physically closer to Otley and [has] as much, if not more, in common with the rural aspect of the proposed ward as those parts of Yeadon and Rawdon added in the City Council submission'.

114 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new Bramhope & Cookridge ward to comprise the majority of the existing Cookridge ward (except for an area broadly south of Tinshill Road, Tinshill Lane and Farrar Lane and west of Raynell Drive and New Adel Lane) and the Leeds and Bradford Airport site and Carlton and Bramhope parishes. They argued that this would avoid splitting the Wharfe Valley and that although Bramhope parish is 'separated from the main

built-up area of Leeds [it] is to the south of the Wharfe Valley and has more linkage to Leeds than the rural area to the north'.

115 The Conservatives and Mr Winfield developed a similar set of proposals for these four wards. They both proposed to revise the existing Otley & Wharfedale ward by using Carlton parish as the south-western boundary (thereby transferring the areas that comprise the Leeds and Bradford Airport site, the parts of Yeadon broadly east of Yeadon Tarn, Dam Lane and Windmill Lane, and the parts of Rawdon east of Harrogate Lane and north of the Leeds Road and west of Well Lane and Billing View), and proposed to retain the existing Cookridge ward. Mr Winfield argued that this would avoid dividing the 'natural community' of Cookridge. They differed slightly in their proposals for the existing Horsforth and Aireborough wards, but they shared the approach of splitting the existing Horsforth ward to join it with Rawdon in the north or Kirkstall in the south. They both proposed that the northern areas of the existing Horsforth ward, comprising an area west of Gill Beck, north of Rawdon Road, Broadway and Stanhope Drive and west of Broadgate Lane, Bachelor Lane and Troy Road, should join with the areas that comprise part of the existing Otley & Wharfedale ward broadly south of Carlton parish and the area broadly east of Banksfield Mount, Coppice Wood Avenue, Swincar Avenue and Park Road and north of Kirk Lane and the High Street which comprises part of the existing Aireborough ward, to comprise the Conservatives' proposed Horsforth & Rawdon ward and Mr Winfield's proposed Horsforth North & Rawdon ward. However, the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals differed in that they proposed for either an area north of Micklefield Lane, east of Apperley Lane, south of Green Lane and west of Harrogate Road, or alternatively an area north of Green Lane, east of Henshaw Lane and South View Road, south of High Street and west of Windmill Lane, should comprise part of their proposed Horsforth & Rawdon and Horsforth North & Rawdon wards respectively. The Conservatives proposed to rename their modified Aireborough ward Guiseley & Yeadon ward to better reflect its constituent area, while Mr Winfield proposed to retain the existing name.

116 Both Mr Winfield and the Conservatives argued that their proposals would have the effect of reuniting a large part of Rawdon within one ward. The Conservatives noted that the warding pattern 'would leave the relatively new Horsforth Parish Council spread across the two city wards', but they considered that 'the advantage gained by reuniting much of Rawdon offsets any perceived disadvantage so far as Horsforth is concerned', particularly as 'Horsforth would have the distinct advantage of having six councillors representing the community'. Mr Winfield also noted that his proposals would divide Horsforth parish between two city wards and stated that this was 'regrettably a result' of placing 'the areas which have to be removed from Aireborough, and Otley & Wharfedale wards' with parts of the existing Horsforth ward, which 'is the natural repository for these voters'.

117 Mr Winfield opposed the City Council's and Liberal Democrats' proposals to unite the Cookridge community and Bramhope parish, suggesting that this would divide the 'natural community' of Cookridge and bring together communities with little affinity which are 'separate built-up areas divided by a substantial belt of open countryside'.

118 Micklefield Parish Council proposed three wards: Otley & Guiseley; Yeadon & Rawdon, 'comprising the whole of both townships, including that part of Rawdon currently in Horsforth ward, plus the community of Carlton'; and a 'revised Horsforth ward, consisting of just Horsforth proper'. Horsforth Town Council argued that it should remain in one city ward and that the present Horsforth ward should be retained as it provides for a good level of electoral equality, uses identifiable boundaries and reflects 'an established community'. Otley Town Council noted that consultation 'has taken place between the Labour Group of Leeds City Council' and itself, and that it 'supports the principle of the formation of an Otley & Yeadon ward'.

119 We have carefully considered all the representations we have received for this area. We note that due to significant under-representation in this area these four wards should comprise five wards. However, we observe that options to accomplish this are limited by the area's

position on the north-western edge of the city boundary. In proposing new warding arrangements for this area we would seek to provide the best reflection of community identities and interests while retaining, as far as possible, a separation between the rural and suburban areas. In this instance, due to the limited options available, we judge that, although there is an element of uniting rural and suburban areas, the City Council's proposals provide for the best reflection of the statutory criteria and the most appropriate solution to the issue of under-representation. In addition we note that its proposed Otley & Yeadon ward has received support from Otley Town Council and that its proposed Horsforth ward reflects the views submitted to us by Horsforth Town Council. Therefore we propose adopting the City Council's proposed Cookridge & Wharfedale, Guiseley & Rawdon, Horsforth and Otley & Yeadon wards.

120 However, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we propose to amend the boundary between the proposed Guiseley & Rawdon and Otley & Yeadon wards to achieve a better level of electoral equality. We propose that the boundary between these two wards follow the rear of the properties on the western side of Coppice Wood Crescent, the western side of Queensway Primary School and then run along the rear of properties on the northern side of Queensway to join with the City Council's proposed boundary.

121 We consider that the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals have merit, in particular with regard to their proposed Otley & Wharfedale ward. We note Mr Winfield's argument that to unite the Cookridge community with Bramhope parish would provide a poor reflection of their community identities and interests. However, we consider that the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposals would not provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria or a more appropriate solution to the issue of under-representation in the area. We have not been convinced by the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's arguments regarding the division of Horsforth Town Council, and therefore we judge that the City Council's proposed Horsforth and Cookridge & Wharfedale wards would secure a better level of effective and convenient local government while providing a good reflection of the statutory criteria and fix clear and identifiable boundaries.

122 We consider that the Liberal Democrats' proposed alternative arrangements do not provide for a better balance between the statutory criteria than the City Council's proposals. We judge that we have received insufficient evidence and argumentation to justify the high level of electoral imbalance secured by their proposed Yeadon & Rawdon ward or that their proposal for a part of Guiseley to comprise part of the proposed Otley & Wharfedale ward would provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria. We judge that Micklefield Parish Council's proposed wards would not secure a better balance between the statutory criteria and that we have received insufficient evidence to justify the high level of electoral variance produced by a ward comprising of 'just Horsforth proper'.

123 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Cookridge & Wharfedale, Guiseley & Rawdon, Horsforth and Otley & Yeadon wards would have 1% fewer, 1% more, 6% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (1% fewer, 6% more, 5% more and 6% more by 2006).

Kirkstall, Moortown, Roundhay and Weetwood wards

124 These four unparished wards comprise the northern area of the city. Kirkstall, Moortown, Roundhay and Weetwood wards have 6% fewer, 1% fewer, 2% more and 1% more electors per councillor than the city average currently (8% fewer, equal to, 1% more and 2% more by 2006).

125 The City Council and Liberal Democrats proposed to broadly retain the existing Kirkstall ward, but to include an area broadly south of the Ring Road and west of Spen Lane within the existing Weetwood ward. The City Council also proposed transferring the Kirkstall Brewery site, which lies within the existing Bramley ward to form part of its proposed Kirkstall ward. The City Council also proposed for the areas which comprise the south-eastern area of the current

Kirkstall ward broadly east of the railway line to be transferred to its proposed City & Riverside and Hyde Park wards.

126 The City Council and Liberal Democrats proposed to broadly retain the existing Weetwood ward. The City Council proposed to transfer the areas broadly south of Tinshill Road and Farrar Lane, and west of Otley Old Road Raynell Drive and New Adel Lane, from the existing Cookridge ward to comprise part of the north-western area of its proposed Weetwood ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed to transfer a similar area south of Tinshill Road, but west of The Foxhills and south of Tinshill Lane and Farrar Lane and west of Raynell Drive and New Adel Lane. They proposed to amend the current Weetwood ward's western boundary with their proposed Horsforth ward, as described above. They proposed to utilise Meanwood Beck as the proposed Weetwood ward's eastern boundary to where it reaches Monk Bridge and then follow Monk Bridge Road. However, the Liberal Democrats proposed that the boundary run along Meanwood Road, while the City Council proposed that it run along Stainbeck Avenue, and that their proposed boundaries then join the existing boundary running along Grove Lane and Stainbeck Road. The Liberal Democrats proposed to rename Weetwood ward Far Headingley & Lawnswood ward and argued that their amendments would include 'the remainder of the Ireland Wood Estate, artificially separated in the last review', would transfer the Meanwood community to their proposed Moortown ward and would secure an eastern boundary that represents 'the natural boundary of the Meanwood Valley rather than the previous arbitrary splitting of recognised communities'.

127 The City Council proposed to transfer the areas broadly east of Meanwood Beck and Mill Race and north of Monk Bridge Road, plus an area east of Stainbeck Avenue and north of Stainbeck Road, from the existing Weetwood ward to comprise part of its proposed Moortown ward. The City Council proposed that this ward comprise much of the existing Moortown ward, but proposed to transfer the area south of Kedleston Road and east of Chelwood Drive and the areas east of Talbot Gardens, south of Talbot Avenue and east of Bentcliffe Gardens and Allerton Grange Avenue, to comprise part of its proposed Roundhay ward, and for the Meanwood Park Hospital site to comprise part of its proposed Alwoodley ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed similar modifications to the existing Moortown ward; however, they proposed that the area east of Meanwood Road be transferred from the existing Weetwood ward and that the areas north and east of Lidgett Lane be transferred to comprise part of their proposed Roundhay ward. The Liberal Democrats also proposed to transfer an area broadly east of King Lane and north of Stonegate Lane from the existing Moortown ward to comprise part of their proposed Alwoodley ward.

128 Both the City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed to broadly retain the existing Roundhay ward. They proposed to utilise the A1620 as the north-eastern boundary, proposing that Shadwell parish be transferred to comprise their proposed Bramham & Harewood ward and that an area broadly north of the A1620 and west of Roundhay Park Lane be transferred to comprise part of their proposed Alwoodley ward. As described above they proposed that similar areas which comprise the current Moortown ward be transferred to comprise part of western area of their proposed Roundhay ward. The Liberal Democrats argued that 'these changes result in a more obvious set of ward boundaries and recognised local communities being united in a single ward'.

129 As described above, the Conservatives and Mr Winfield proposed that the existing Horsforth ward should be reconfigured into Horsforth north and south regions. They proposed that areas comprising the south region, broadly east of Gill Beck and south of Rawdon Road, Broadway and Stanhope Drive and east of Broadgate Lane, Bachelor Lane and Troy Lane, should link with the areas comprising the northern area of the existing Kirkstall ward, broadly north of the River Aire and west of Woodside View and St Ann's Lane, to comprise a new Horsforth South & Kirkstall ward. They both proposed to retain the existing Weetwood ward, which Mr Winfield suggested did not 'merit alteration'.

130 Mr Winfield proposed to amend the existing Moortown and Roundhay wards. He proposed a new Moortown ward retaining the existing southern and western boundary, but proposed 'a natural transfer' of an area west of Saxon Grove, Cranmer Bank and south of Deanswood Rise from the existing North ward to comprise part of a modified Moortown ward. He proposed to transfer an area broadly west of Bentcliffe Drive, Bentcliffe Gardens, Lidgett Lane and Chandos Garth and north of Chandos Gardens and The Drive (comprising part of the eastern area of the existing Moortown ward) to his proposed Roundhay ward. Mr Winfield contended that these proposals would be 'the neatest solution in terms of numbers and communities'. He proposed that the proposed Roundhay ward comprise the majority of the existing ward, but he proposed that an area broadly west of Hetton Road and south of Copgrove Road, west of Dean Court and south of Well House Avenue, comprising the south-western area, be transferred to comprise part of his proposed Harehills ward as the area has 'changed in socio-economic characteristics, such that the area has more in common with the Harehills ward'.

131 The Conservatives proposed to rearrange the northern and southern boundaries of the existing Moortown ward. They proposed that an area broadly west of Harrogate Road and south of Nursery Lane, west of King Lane and south of Buck Stone Road be transferred from the south-western area of the current North ward to comprise part of the north-eastern area of their modified Moortown ward. They proposed that an area broadly east of Scott Hall Road and south of Broomhill Drive, Nunroyd Road and Stainburn Avenue, west of Lidgett Lane and Chandos Garth and south of Chandos Gardens be transferred from the southern area of the existing Moortown ward to comprise part of their proposed Chapel Allerton ward. The Conservatives proposed to amend the existing Roundhay ward by transferring the same south-western area as proposed by Mr Winfield to their proposed Harehills ward and linking the rest of the current Roundhay ward with the parishes of Scarcroft and Thorner to comprise their proposed Roundhay & Thorner ward.

132 Councillor Illingworth (Kirkstall ward) opposed the Conservatives' proposal to 'amalgamate parts of the existing Kirkstall and Horsforth wards' as 'these two wards are separated by a deep ravine' meaning that there is 'little contact between these two communities'. Leeds Left Alliance proposed that the existing Roundhay ward be retained as it would continue to secure a good level of electoral equality. Spen Lane & West Park Residents' Association considered 'that the present boundaries should broadly remain as they are at present as the area itself has had no significant changes in respect of new housing or demolition of homes'.

133 We have carefully considered all the representations we have received for this area. We propose to adopt the proposals submitted to us by the City Council as we judge that its proposed Kirkstall, Moortown, Roundhay and Weetwood wards would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. We note that the Liberal Democrats submitted similar proposals for this area. As we have proposed to utilise the similar proposals submitted to us by the City Council and the Liberal Democrats for other areas we are unable to utilise the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposed warding pattern for the existing Kirkstall, Roundhay and Weetwood wards. We also judge that their proposals for the existing Kirkstall and Roundhay wards would not provide for a better reflection of the statutory criteria, particularly with regard to uniting communities either side of Hawksworth Wood, and their proposed modification to a southern area of the existing Roundhay ward. We note Councillor Illingworth's opposition to the Kirkstall Brewery site being included in the proposed Kirkstall ward; however, we consider that we have received insufficient evidence to suggest that the City Council's proposal does not provide a good reflection of the statutory criteria.

134 We consider that the City Council's proposals secure a better reflection of the statutory criteria than the Liberal Democrats'. We judge that the City Council's proposed Kirkstall ward would provide for a better reflection of community identity and provide for a generally stronger boundary. We consider that the City Council's proposed Moortown ward's modified eastern

boundary would be more identifiable and that the use of Stainbeck Avenue would provide for a better reflection of community identities in the Meanwood area.

135 As discussed above, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that the proposed Moortown ward's boundary would not utilise the most identifiable boundary in the area (the A1620), and that the proposal for the Meanwood Park Hospital site to comprise part of the proposed Alwoodley ward would not provide a good reflection of community identity. Therefore we propose that the proposed Moortown ward's northern boundary should follow the A1620 Ring Road in order that the Meanwood Park Hospital site comprise part of its north-eastern area.

136 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Kirkstall, Moortown, Roundhay and Weetwood wards would have 1% more, 4% more, 5% more and equal to the average number of electors per councillor for the city average currently (1% fewer, 5% more, 3% more and equal to the average by 2006).

Halton, Seacroft and Whinmoor wards

137 These three wards comprise the eastern area of the city. Both Halton and Seacroft wards are unparished and have 11% more and 28% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (9% more and 32% fewer by 2006). Whinmoor ward encompasses both an urban and a rural area by comprising Scholes parish ward of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish, and has 22% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (26% fewer by 2006).

138 The City Council proposed to retain the urban area of the existing Whinmoor ward by transferring Scholes parish ward of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish to its proposed Bramham & Harewood ward. It proposed that the unparished urban area be combined with the north-eastern area of the existing Halton ward broadly north of the railway line and Whitkirk Lane and east of the A6120 to comprise a new Cross Gates ward. It proposed that much of the existing Halton ward comprise a new Temple Newsam ward, proposing to modify the eastern and southern boundary to follow the M1 motorway so that the area east of the motorway comprising part of Austhorpe parish and the area south of the motorway comprising Newsam Green be transferred to comprise part of its proposed Garforth & Swillington ward, while the areas west of the motorway that comprise part of Swillington parish comprise part of its proposed Temple Newsam ward. It proposed to modify the current Halton ward's western boundary to transfer an area broadly south of the railway line comprising the existing Burmantofts ward and an area broadly east of the railway line, Neville Close, Felnax Road and north of Pontefract Lane from the current Richmond Hill ward to comprise the western area of its proposed Temple Newsam ward. The City Council proposed to expand the existing Seacroft ward by transferring an area broadly east of Oakwood Lane and north of Fearnville Road from the existing Harehills ward and the areas broadly north of the railway line and east of Wyke Beck from the existing Burmantofts ward.

139 The Liberal Democrats proposed to divide the existing Seacroft ward between two new wards. They proposed to combine an area comprising the northern area of the existing Seacroft ward, generally north of North Parkway, with the existing Whinmoor ward to comprise a new Whinmoor & North Seacroft ward, arguing that this would 'result in a ward made up of similar communities'. They proposed to combine an area comprising the southern area of the existing Seacroft ward generally south of North Parkway with an area comprising the north-eastern part of the existing Halton ward, broadly north of Austhorpe parish, Station Road and Selby Road, to comprise a new Crossgates & Seacroft ward, arguing that this produces 'a more cohesive and homogenous ward' than 'maintaining a Seacroft ward and Crossgates ward'. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the area west of Station Road and Selby Road comprising the existing Halton ward join with the same area the City Council proposed to transfer from the

southern area of the existing Burmantofts ward and the eastern area of the current Richmond Hill ward to comprise a new Halton & Osmondthorpe ward.

140 The Conservatives proposed three wards broadly based on the existing Halton, Seacroft and Whinmoor wards. They proposed to retain the existing Halton ward, but proposed to transfer an area broadly west of Klemcott Lane and north of Manston Gardens and Manston Drive to comprise part of their proposed Seacroft ward. They proposed to expand the existing Seacroft ward to include the same area the City Council proposed to transfer from the existing Harehills ward and an area comprising the eastern area of the existing Burmantofts ward broadly south of Foundry Lane, east of Wyke Beck, and north of York Road and the railway line. The Conservatives proposed to expand the existing Whinmoor ward to include the parishes of Aberford and Bramhope cum Oglethorpe and Barwick parish ward of Barwick in Elmet and Scholes parish to comprise a new Barwick & Whinmoor ward.

141 Mr Winfield proposed to broadly retain the existing Halton ward, but proposed to transfer the same area as the Conservatives and the area broadly north of Pendas Grove and west of Penda's Way to his proposed Seacroft North ward. He proposed that the current Whinmoor ward be split between two new wards representing the 'two dissimilar elements' of the Whinmoor and Swarcliffe estates and the Red Hall and Scholes areas. He proposed for Scholes parish ward and the areas broadly east of the Ring Road and north of Naburn Approach to comprise the Barwick & Collingham ward described above. He proposed that the remaining parts of the existing Whinmoor ward be combined with those parts of the existing Seacroft ward north of South Parkside and Stocks Approach to comprise a new Seacroft North ward. He proposed that the areas south of South Parkside and Stocks Approach join with parts of the existing Burmantofts and Richmond Hill wards to comprise a Seacroft South and Halton Moor ward, described in more detail below.

142 We have carefully considered all the submissions we have received for this area. We propose to broadly adopt the City Council's proposals for this area as part of our draft recommendations. We judge that the City Council's proposals would secure the best balance between the statutory criteria. We consider that its proposed Cross Gates and Seacroft wards would provide a better reflection of community identities than the other proposals we have received. Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that Mr Winfield, the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats all proposed wards which breach the A1620 Ring Road, which we judge to be a strong and identifiable boundary and a clear demarcation between two urban areas. However, as discussed above, the City Council's proposal to use the M1 motorway as its proposed Temple Newsam ward's eastern boundary would require the creation of unviable parish wards of the parishes of Austhorpe and Swillington. Therefore we propose that the eastern boundary follow Swillington parish's western boundary until it intersects with the M1, which the boundary would follow westwards as proposed by the City Council, and we propose to adopt the Liberal Democrats' proposal for Austhorpe parish to form part of the proposed Garforth & Swillington ward.

143 Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that parts of the City Council's proposals would not provide the best reflection of community identities in the area. We were concerned that the proposed Cross Gates ward name would not provide an accurate reflection of its comprising communities, as it would not contain part of the Cross Gates area broadly south of York Road and north of the railway. However, proposing that this area be included in the proposed Cross Gates ward would have a detrimental effect on electoral equality. We considered the option of renaming both the proposed Cross Gates and Seacroft wards to provide a better reflection of their comprising areas, but in light of the consultation carried out on ward names we are reluctant to propose such an amendment, however, we would welcome comments regarding this issue during Stage Three. We were concerned that the area south of the railway line proposed by the Liberal Democrats and City Council to comprise part of the proposed Cross Gates ward would identify with the Whitkirk area to the west rather than the areas to the north. However, we note that the areas broadly north and

south of the railway line comprise part of the existing Halton ward. We were concerned that the City Council's proposal that part of the existing Harehills ward comprise part of the proposed Seacroft ward would place the Hollin Park area within a ward which it had no direct access. In spite of this, proposing amendments for these areas would either have a detrimental effect on electoral equality, due to the substantial size of each of the area's electorates, or on community identities, if the Hollin Park area was to be split between two wards, and therefore would not provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. However, we propose to amend the proposed boundary where it runs along the centre of Fearnville Road so that it follows the rear of the properties on the south side.

144 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Cross Gates, Seacroft and Temple Newsam wards would have 7% more, 2% more and 2% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (3% more, equal to the average and 4% fewer by 2006).

Burmantofts, Chapel Allerton, Harehills, Headingley, Richmond Hill and University wards

145 These six unparished wards comprise the north and east central areas of the city. Burmantofts, Chapel Allerton, Harehills, Headingley, Richmond Hill and University wards have 23% fewer, 11% fewer, 16% fewer, 27% more, 26% fewer and 4% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (22% fewer, 11% fewer, 18% fewer, 25% more, 27% fewer and 2% fewer by 2006).

146 The City Council proposed to split the existing Burmantofts ward between three wards. As discussed above, it proposed that the eastern area comprise the southern area of its proposed Seacroft ward. It proposed that the western area broadly to the west of Harehills Recreation Ground and Harehills Cemetery combine with the area comprising the existing Richmond Hill ward west of the railway line, Neville Close, Felnax Road and south of Pontefract Lane and an area comprising the eastern part of the existing University ward broadly east of Beckett Street, Lincoln Road, Cherry Row and Macaulay Street and Mabgate, to comprise a new Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward. The City Council proposed to modify the existing Richmond Hill ward's western boundary so that an area broadly west of Marsh Lane, East Street and South Accommodation Road would be transferred to comprise part of its proposed City & Riverside ward. The City Council proposed that the central area of the existing Burmantofts ward, broadly west of Wyke Beck and east of Harehills Recreation Ground and Harehills Cemetery and north of York Road, combine with the majority of the Harehills ward (except for the area proposed to comprise part of its proposed Seacroft ward) and an area comprising the north-eastern part of the existing University ward broadly north of Grant Avenue and Rosebud Walk, east of Dolly Lane, and north of Lincoln Road and Rectory Street and east of Beckett Street, to comprise a new Gipton & Harehills ward. The City Council proposed to modify the existing Harehills ward's western boundary where it follows Spencer Place so that it would run along Gathorne Street, turning on to Spencer Mount and then turning to follow Back Rossington Road, then Back Hares Mount, and then turning onto Pasture Road to join with the existing boundary of Spencer Place so that the properties west of this boundary would be transferred to its proposed Chapel Allerton ward.

147 The City Council proposed to broadly retain the current Chapel Allerton ward, amending the north and west boundary. It proposed to utilise Stainbeck Road, and then for the boundary to turn to follow Meanwood Road until it joins with Clay Pit Lane where the boundary would turn northwards to join the existing boundary of Barrack Road, in order that the areas east of these features comprise part of the western area of its proposed Chapel Allerton ward. It proposed that the area west of Meanwood Road comprise a modified Headingley ward to include the rest of the existing ward, except for an area broadly south of Victoria Road and east of Back Ash Grove and Queen's Road, which the City Council proposed to comprise part of its proposed Hyde Park ward. The City Council proposed that this new Hyde Park ward would comprise the majority of the existing University ward broadly west of Meanwood Road and North Street and

north of Burley Road, Park Lane, Hanover Square, Dension Road, Woodhouse Square, Little Woodhouse Street and Claredon Way. The City Council proposed to transfer a southern area of the existing Kirkstall ward broadly east of the railway line and north of Kirkstall Road to comprise part of the western area of its proposed Hyde Park ward.

148 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the majority of the existing Burmantofts area, except for the area broadly north of Foundry Lane, Wykebeck Valley Road and Coldcotes Drive and an area south of the railway line, should be combined with an area comprising the existing Richmond Hill ward west of the railway line, Neville Close, Felnex Road and south of Pontefract Lane, to form a new Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the areas broadly north of Foundry Lane, Wykebeck Valley Road and Coldcotes Drive should comprise a new Harehills & Lincoln Green ward. This ward would comprise the majority of the existing Harehills ward, except for an area west of Roundhay Road, and include the eastern area of the existing University ward broadly east of Roseville Road, Cross Stamford Street and North Street and south of Skinner Lane, which would reflect 'the parts of the area traditionally known as Harehills' and incorporate 'the whole of the Harehills Regeneration Area'.

149 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the areas comprising the existing University ward west of Roseville Road, Cross Stamford Street and North Street should form a new Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward. However, they proposed that the areas broadly south of Burley Road and Park Lane and east of Studio Road be transferred to comprise part of their proposed City & Riverside ward and that the area north and east of Meanwood Road and Sackville Street be transferred to comprise part of their proposed Chapel Allerton Ward. They proposed that the existing University ward's western boundary should be amended in order that the areas broadly east and south of Queen's Road, Back Chestnut Avenue, Buckingham Road, Cumberland Road and Boothroyd Drive be transferred from the existing Headingley ward to comprise the western area of their proposed Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward. With this amendment to the existing Headingley ward's eastern boundary the Liberal Democrats proposed that the remaining area, except for an area east of Meanwood Road proposed to comprise part of their proposed Chapel Allerton ward, comprise a modified Headingley ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed to broadly retain the existing Chapel Allerton ward. They proposed that the area broadly east of Meanwood Road, between Stainbeck Road and Sackville Street, be transferred from the existing Headingley and University wards, and that the area broadly west of Roundhay Road be transferred from the existing Harehills ward, to comprise part of their proposed modified Chapel Allerton ward.

150 Mr Winfield proposed that the existing Burmantofts ward should be reconfigured to comprise parts of three new wards and for the existing University ward to 'be divided into its natural communities'. He proposed that the areas broadly south of South Parkside and Stocks Approach within the current Seacroft ward should join with the eastern area of the existing Burmantofts ward (broadly east of St Alban Road and Roberts Avenue, and south of Coldcotes Drive, and south of Wykebeck Valley Road and Wyke Beck) and with the north-eastern area of the current Richmond Hill ward, broadly east of Ivy Street, Ings Crescent and Felnex Crescent, and north of Pontefract Lane, to form a new Seacroft & Halton Moor ward. He proposed largely retaining the existing Harehills ward, transferring the area largely west of Roundhay Road and south of Ellers Road to his proposed Chapel Allerton ward. Mr Winfield proposed that the northern part of the existing Burmantofts ward, broadly east of Harehills Recreation Ground and north of Harehills Cemetery, Coldcotes Drive and Wykebeck Valley Road, and an area broadly north of Rosebud Walk and Bayswater Road in the existing University ward, should also comprise part of his proposed Harehills ward. As discussed above, he also proposed to transfer a south-western area from the existing Roundhay ward to comprise part of his proposed Harehills ward.

151 Mr Winfield proposed that the area comprising the western area of the existing Burmantofts ward, broadly west of Harehills Recreation Park and Harehills Cemetery, should unite with the central and eastern area of the existing University ward, broadly east of Johnston

Street, Woodhouse Street, St Mark's Road, Servia Hill, Blackman Lane and Lofthouse Place, and the eastern area of the existing Richmond Hill ward, broadly east of Ivy Street and Nixon Avenue, to comprise a new Little London & Burmantofts ward. He proposed that the western area of the existing University ward combine with an eastern area of Headingley ward, broadly east of North Grange Road, Buckingham Road and Brudenell Road, and an area east of the railway line comprising part of the existing Kirkstall ward to comprise a new University ward. He proposed that the western area of the existing Headingley ward combine with the southern area of the existing Kirkstall ward, broadly east of Woodside View and St Ann's Lane, to comprise a new Headingley & Burley ward. However, he proposed that the areas broadly east of Batty's Wood, comprising part of the existing Headingley ward, be transferred to comprise part of his proposed Chapel Allerton ward. He proposed to modify the existing Chapel Allerton ward to include the areas west and south of Roundhay Road and Eller Road within the current Harehills ward, and the areas broadly east and north of Hartley Avenue and Melville Place within the current University ward; however, he proposed transferring an area broadly east of Dominion Avenue, King George Avenue and north of Gledhow Park Avenue from the existing Chapel Allerton ward to his proposed Roundhay ward.

152 The Conservatives proposed to split the existing Burmantofts ward in approximately the same manner as the City Council, proposing that the three regions comprise part of three new wards. As described above, they proposed that the eastern area comprise the southern area of their proposed Seacroft ward. They proposed that the central region and the areas south of York Road and west of Watson Road unite with the existing Richmond Hill ward to form a modified Richmond Hill ward. They proposed that the western area combine with the majority of the existing University ward, except for the area south of Woodhouse Lane and Moorland Road, and an area comprising the existing Headingley ward, broadly east of North Grange Lane, north of Victoria Road and south of Batty's Wood, to comprise a new Burmantofts ward. They proposed that the area south of Woodhouse Lane and Moorland Road, comprising part of the existing University ward, combine with the area broadly east of Woodside View and St Ann's Lane, comprising part of the existing Kirkstall ward, and an area south of Brudenell Road comprising part of the existing Headingley ward to comprise a new University ward. The Conservatives proposed to broadly retain the existing Headingley ward except for the two proposed transfers described above. They proposed to modify the existing Harehills ward, transferring an area broadly east of Oakwood Lane to their proposed Seacroft ward, to incorporate the same area that Mr Winfield proposed to transfer from the existing Roundhay ward and to incorporate a south-eastern area from the existing Chapel Allerton ward. They proposed that an area broadly south of Gledhow Park Avenue, east of Potternewton Park and Chapel Town Road and north of Francis Street be transferred from the existing Chapel Allerton ward to comprise the north-western area of their proposed Harehills ward. With this amendment they proposed to broadly retain the existing Chapel Allerton ward, but proposed to transfer an area, described above, from the existing Moortown ward to comprise the north-eastern area of their proposed Chapel Allerton ward.

153 East Park Community Association declared its support for the City Council's proposals for the existing Richmond ward. A local resident argued that the use of Spencer Place as the boundary between the existing Chapel Allerton and Harehills wards should be retained as it provides an accurate reflection of the demarcation line between the two communities. The local resident proposed an alternative arrangement for a Harehills & Burmantofts ward comprising a western area of the existing Harehills ward, broadly west of St Wilfred's Circus, a western area of the existing Burmantofts ward, broadly west of Harehills Cemetery, and an eastern area of the existing University ward, broadly east of Roseville Road and North Street, and an enlarged Gipton ward 'with some of the old Richmond Hill ward'.

154 Leeds Left Alliance proposed an amendment to transfer some 700 electors broadly south of Stainbeck Road from the existing Moortown ward to comprise part of the existing Chapel Allerton ward. It argued that this would provide for a more identifiable boundary as it would utilise a 'main road' which 'is clearly a natural divider, not a natural focus' for community

services and that this area 'is naturally a part of Chapel Allerton'. The Alliance commented that 'the natural, identifiable south west boundary of Chapel Allerton is the long strip of open land, known as Meanwood Valley'. The Alliance opposed the City Council's proposal that the Sugarwell Estate comprise part of its proposed Chapel Allerton ward. It argued that the estate 'lies on the far side of this natural divide from Chapel Allerton' and that it does not share community services with the rest of Chapel Allerton.

155 We have carefully considered all the submissions we have received for this area. We propose to adopt the proposals submitted by the City Council as we judge that they provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. In addition we note that the City Council's proposed Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward has received support from East Park Community Association and coincides with the views of a local resident regarding the use of Spencer Lane as a boundary. We judge that Mr Winfield's proposed Little London & Burmantofts ward and the Conservatives' proposed Burmantofts ward would not provide for a better reflection of community identity or better level of effective and convenient local government than the City Council's proposals. As we propose to adopt the City Council's proposed Seacroft ward we are unable to adopt the Liberal Democrats' proposed Burmantofts & Richmond Hill ward. We judge that, in comparison, the City Council's proposed Gipton & Harehills ward provides for a better reflection of the statutory criteria and that its proposed Headingley ward's boundary would secure a better level of electoral equality than the Liberal Democrats' proposed alternative arrangements.

156 Officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that two of the proposed boundaries put forward by the City Council were not easily identifiable. Therefore we propose to amend the boundary between the proposed Chapel Allerton and Gipton & Harehills wards so that it would not turn and follow Harehills Lane, but continue on Harehills Avenue until it joined the existing boundary of Gledhow Valley Road. We propose to amend the boundary between the proposed Gipton & Harhills and Burmantofts & Richmond Hill wards to depart from Foundry Approach, following the rear of the properties on the western side of Harehills Park View. We were concerned that the City Council's proposed Chapel Allerton ward's western boundary utilising Meanwood Road would divide communities. Therefore we propose to amend the boundary to follow the rear of properties on the residential roads on the west side of Meanwood Road and then rejoin Meanwood Road at the junction with Ridge Road.

157 We note Leeds Left Alliance's argument that the Sugarwell Estate is divided by the Meanwood Valley, and its proposed amendment to the boundary between the existing Moortown and Chapel Allerton wards. We consider that the Alliance has not provided sufficient evidence or argumentation to justify the deterioration in electoral equality that would result in proposing that this area comprise part of the proposed Hyde Park ward, or the deterioration in electoral equality secured by its proposed Chapel Allerton ward. We have considered the local resident's proposed Harehills & Burmantofts ward; however, we are unable to consider such a proposal in isolation, and we judge that we have not received sufficient evidence to accept the deterioration in electoral equality in the surrounding wards.

158 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Chapel Allerton, Gipton & Harehills, Headingley and Hyde Park wards would have 4% fewer, 2% more, 3% fewer, 1% more and 3% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (6% fewer, 2% more, 6% fewer, equal to and equal to the average by 2006).

Beeston, City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards

159 These three unparished wards comprise the south-western central area of the city. Beeston, City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards have 26% fewer, 9% fewer and 33% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (29% fewer, 3% more and 31% fewer by 2006).

160 Beeston Community Forum argued that the existing arrangement artificially divides the natural community of Beeston. It proposed a new Beeston ward 'in order to unite a community'. The Forum provided substantial evidence regarding the community identity and interests of the Beeston community, and argumentation to indicate how the use of Beeston Town Street as the boundary between the existing Beeston and City & Holbeck wards does not represent a clear delineation between communities, but rather represents the 'geographical' and 'social centre of [the Beeston] community'. The Forum provided evidence and argumentation suggesting that the existing arrangements do not secure convenient local government as it judged that 'those residents who live adjacent to a political boundary will suffer some degree of marginalisation'. It contended that as 'the real community is fragmented' it is unable 'to ensure that [its] views are taken note of by the two sets of politicians that [it] has separately elected'.

161 The Forum defined the geographical area that best represents the Beeston community. It argued that Cross Flatts Park represents a clear delineation between two communities and contended that two research studies conducted of this area suggested 'that people in the two separate areas [east and west of Cross Flatts Park] hold completely diametrically opposite views of their respective neighbourhoods'. The Forum maintained that 'the residents of the real Beeston i.e. above Cross Flatts Park consider that their area is a safe place with a sense of community' while 'the residents of west Hunslet/Tempest Road area consider it an unsafe area with little or no sense of community'.

162 As the Forum proposed a reduction in council size it approached its proposed reconfiguration of this area within a 32-ward structure. However, it is worth noting the Forum's proposed modified Beeston ward. The Forum proposed to amend the current Beeston ward to incorporate an area broadly north of Crosslands Road and Harwill Croft within Churwell parish ward of Morley Town Council, comprising part of the current Morley North ward, and an area broadly south of Brown Lane West, the M621 and west of Beeston Road, comprising part of the existing City & Holbeck ward; however, the Forum proposed to transfer an area north of Cross Flatts Park and Middleton Grove comprising part of the north-eastern area of the existing Beeston ward.

163 The City Council and Liberal Democrats proposed a substantial reconfiguration of this area. They proposed to reconfigure the existing City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards to form a new City & Riverside ward. They proposed to modify the existing City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards' boundaries. Starting in the east, they proposed that the existing City & Holbeck ward's boundary continue east on the railway line adjacent to Whitehall Road and Wortley Recreation Ground, which would entail transferring the areas west of these features to their proposed Farnley & Wortley and Wortley wards respectively. They proposed that the boundary then follow the railway line adjacent to Oldfield Lane and Wellington Road, then run along the edge of Wellington Road to connect with the railway line adjacent to Canal Street, which would entail transferring the areas west of these features to their proposed Armley ward. The City Council proposed that the boundary follow this railway line until the A65 which it would briefly follow eastwards and then depart to follow the rear of the properties on Willow Close and Willow Avenue to join and run along Burley Road. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the boundary follow the railway line, from which it would depart to briefly follow the River Aire and then the rear of the property east of Viaduct Road to then join and run along the A65, which it would depart from to follow Studio Road and then Burley Road. The City Council's proposals would entail transferring the area broadly south of Burley Road from the existing University ward to its proposed City & Riverside ward and the area to the north to its Hyde Park ward. The Liberal Democrats' proposals would entail an area broadly east of Studio Road and south of Burley Road being transferred from the existing University ward to their proposed City & Riverside ward and the area west of Studio Road and north of the A65 to their proposed Hyde Park & Woodhouse ward.

164 From Burley Road the Liberal Democrats proposed that the boundary run along Park Lane to join the existing boundary of the Inner Ring Road, transferring the area south of Park

Lane from the existing University ward to the proposed City & Riverside ward. However, the City Council proposed that the boundary depart from Park Lane to follow the back of properties on Hanover Square and then Park Lane College to follow Dension Road and Woodhouse Square and Claredon Road and then run along Chorley Lane and Little Woodhouse Street and then the western edge of the electricity station onto Claredon Way and then follow Calverley Street to join the existing boundary of the Inner Ring Road, transferring the areas south and east of these roads and features from the existing University ward to its proposed City & Riverside ward.

165 The Liberal Democrats proposed to utilise the existing eastern boundaries of the current City & Holbeck and Hunslet wards where they follow the Inner Ring Road, the A61 and the River Aire. The City Council proposed that the boundary depart from the Inner Ring Road to follow North Street to join Clay Pit Lane and run to Barrack Road, which it would follow until briefly running along Roundhay Road, turning along Grant Avenue and Rosebud Walk, and then Dolly Lane and Cherry Row. From here the City Council proposed that the boundary briefly follow Lincoln Green Road, turning to run along Macaulay Street, then Argyle Road, and then along Mabgate to join the existing boundary of the Inner Ring Road. The area enclosed by these roads are within the existing University ward, but would be transferred to the City Council's proposed City & Riverside ward. The City Council proposed that the boundary depart from the Inner Ring Road to follow York Street and then run along Marsh Lane and then follow East Street and South Accommodation Street to join the existing Hunslet ward's north-eastern boundary of the River Aire.

166 Both the City Council and the Liberal Democrats proposed that the boundary depart from the River Aire to follow the M1. The City Council proposed that the boundary should continue on the M1 until the M621 which it would follow northwards; however, the Liberal Democrats proposed to depart from the M1 to follow the existing Hunslet ward's boundary, utilising the dismantled railway line, Wood Lane and Wakefield Road before returning to the M1 and then following the M621 northwards. They proposed that the areas broadly south of the A621 be transferred from the existing Hunslet ward to comprise part of their proposed Middleton Park ward.

167 The City Council and the Liberal Democrats approached their proposals to modify the existing Beeston ward in a similar manner by proposing to retain the existing eastern and southern boundary, but proposed a different boundary dividing their proposed Beeston and City & Riverside wards. The City Council proposed that the areas comprising the existing City & Holbeck ward broadly south of Low Fields Road, the M621 and Low End Place, west of Beeston Road and Lodge Lane be transferred to comprise part of its proposed Beeston ward. However, the City Council proposed that the areas east of Dewsbury Road and Middleton Grove be transferred from the existing Beeston ward to comprise part of its proposed City & Riverside ward. The Liberal Democrats proposed that the areas comprising the existing City & Holbeck ward broadly south of Low Fields Road, the M621, Malvern Road and Coupland Street and west of Dewsbury Road be transferred to their proposed Beeston ward.

168 The Conservatives and Mr Winfield proposed to broadly retain the existing City & Holbeck ward, but proposed to amend the southern boundary in order that the areas north of Cross Flatts Park and Middleton Grove comprising part of the existing Beeston ward comprise the southern part of their proposed City & Holbeck ward, and they proposed that the areas broadly south of Low Fields Road and Elland Road, and Holbeck Cemetery, be transferred from the existing City & Holbeck ward to their proposed Beeston ward. They both proposed that this ward comprise the majority of the existing Beeston ward, subject to the amendments described, but proposed to transfer Churwell parish ward of Morley Town Council from the existing Morley North ward to their proposed Beeston ward. The Conservatives proposed to name this Beeston ward, but Mr Winfield proposed to name the new ward Beeston & Churwell ward.

169 Mr Winfield specified similar arguments to Beeston Community Forum, in that he too argued that the existing arrangements divide a community and that Cross Flatts Park

represents a clear delineation between two communities. He argued that the Beeston and Churwell communities share a greater degree of affinity than the Beeston and Holbeck communities. He also argued that joining these two communities was the best arrangement to contain the Beeston community in a single ward, especially as an arrangement that joined the Beeston community with areas north of Cross Flatts Park would entail 'dividing a community which...suffers from social deprivation', implying that this would not secure effective and convenient local government. This is a similar argument employed by Beeston Community Forum to suggest that their proposed arrangement would 'assist the residents of the area north of Cross Flatts Park in their efforts to reverse the present pattern of social decline'.

170 The Conservatives and Mr Winfield also proposed similar modifications to the existing Hunslet ward as they proposed for the northern parts of the existing Middleton ward to unite with the existing Hunslet ward to comprise a new ward. The Conservatives proposed that the area broadly east of Beeston Park Ring Road, north of Middleton Park Ring Road, Cranmore estate and Sharpe Lane be transferred from the existing Middleton ward to comprise the southern part of its proposed Hunslet & Belle Isle ward. Mr Winfield proposed that the areas broadly north of Bodmin Terrace, Middleton Park Ring Road and Ledbury Estate, and west of the M1, be transferred from the existing Middleton ward to comprise the southern part of his proposed Hunslet & Middleton Park ward. Mr Winfield argued that this would place the whole of the Belle Isle community in a single city ward with the Weetwood Estate and parts of the Middleton Park community to 'form a continuous built-up area' and that the name would reflect the constituent communities.

171 A local resident, supported by a further three local residents, proposed a new Beeston ward to be bounded by the M621 motorway to the north, Middleton railway to the east, Middleton Park to the south and the Ring Road to the west. The resident argued that this would reunite the Beeston community which had been split during the last boundary review, provide for identifiable boundaries and represent 'a distinct area'. The resident approached this proposal with the judgement that 'the number of wards should be reduced to 32' to reflect the fact that Leeds has eight parliamentary constituencies, so that if there were 32 wards 'then four wards would form a constituency instead of the anomaly of one having five wards'.

172 We have carefully considered all the submissions we have received for this area. We propose to adopt the proposals submitted to us by the City Council. We note that the Liberal Democrats submitted similar proposals for this area. We have considered Beeston Community Forum's argument that the Beeston community is divided by the existing electoral arrangements. The Forum has provided substantial evidence of the area's community identity in support of its argument and provided detailed examples of the way in which the current arrangements divide the community. We also note that Mr Winfield has argued a similar case that the existing arrangements divide the Beeston community and proposed a similar modified Beeston ward. However, we are not convinced that the Forum's, the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposal to unite the Beeston community with Churwell parish ward of Morley Town Council would provide the best balance between the statutory criteria. The Forum argued that Cross Flatts Park demarcates two communities, but we consider that the railway line also provides a clear demarcation between the two communities of Beeston and Churwell. Nor are we convinced that the community comprising Churwell parish ward shares more affinity with the Beeston community than the other communities that comprise the Morley area. In addition Morley Town Council has stated its opposition to Churwell parish ward becoming part of a new Beeston ward.

173 We judge that the best balance between the statutory criteria would be provided by the similar proposals submitted to us by the City Council and Liberal Democrats for the Beeston community and part of the Beeston Hill area to comprise a new Beeston ward, and therefore we propose to broadly adopt their proposed Beeston ward as part of our draft recommendations. However, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were concerned that parts of the boundaries proposed by the City Council and the Liberal Democrats were not easily

identifiable. Therefore we propose that the boundary depart from the M621 motorway to follow the west side of the properties on Baron Close and Buckton View and then ground detail through Holbeck Cemetery, to join and run along Beeston Road until Coupland Street, which it would follow, as suggested by the Liberal Democrats, but then depart to follow the north and east edge of the Allotment Gardens to join and run along Dewsbury Road to join with the City Council's proposed boundary.

174 We propose to adopt the proposal for a new City & Riverside ward submitted to us by the City Council. We note that the Liberal Democrats submitted a similar proposal. We judge that the proposal to divide the existing Hunslet ward, utilising the A621, to comprise parts of two new wards would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the similar proposals submitted to us by the Conservatives and Mr Winfield to unite part of the existing Middleton Park ward with the existing Hunslet ward to comprise their proposed Hunslet & Belle Isle and Hunslet & Middleton Park wards respectively.

175 We consider that the City Council's proposed City & Riverside ward would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria while fixing identifiable boundaries than the Liberal Democrats' alternative. We were concerned that the City Council's proposal would breach strong geographical features and would not secure identifiable boundaries. However, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we are aware that the City Council has attempted to create a separation between the more commercial centre and the surrounding residential areas. We are minded to agree with the City Council that this approach has merit and would provide a good reflection of the statutory criteria.

176 Under our draft recommendations our proposed Beeston ward and City & Riverside ward would have equal to and 21% fewer electors per councillor than the city average currently (3% fewer and 7% fewer by 2006).

Electoral cycle

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

Conclusions

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

- the current City Council of 99 members should be retained;
- there should be 33 wards;
- the boundaries of all 33 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

- we propose adopting part of the Liberal Democrats', the Conservatives' and Mr Winfield's proposed boundaries for our proposed Garforth & Swillington, Bramham & Harewood and Kippax & Methley wards;
- we propose boundary amendments affecting the proposed Ardsley & Robin Hood, Bramley, Burmantofts & Richmond Hill, Calverley & Farsley, Chapel Allerton, Gipton & Harehills, Guiseley & Rawdon, Headingley, Hyde Park, Morley South, Otley & Yeadon, Pudsey, Rothwell and Seacroft wards;
- we propose significant amendments to the proposed Alwoodley, Beeston, Bramham & Harewood, City & Riverside, Moortown and Wetherby wards.

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

Table 5: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 Electorate		2006 Electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	99	99	99	99
Number of wards	33	33	33	33
Average number of electors per councillor	5,421	5,421	5,554	5,554
Number of wards with a variance of more than 10 per cent from the average	17	1	16	0
Number of wards with a variance of more than 20 per cent from the average	9	1	11	0

181 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Leeds City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 17 to one. By 2006 no wards are forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

Draft recommendation

Leeds City Council should comprise 99 councillors serving 33 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

182 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different city wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the city. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for Harewood parish to reflect the proposed city wards.

183 The parish of Harewood is currently served by nine parish councillors, representing two wards, Harewood & Wike and Wigton, represented by two and seven parish councillors respectively. In light of our draft recommendations for city wards in this area we are proposing to modify the boundary between the two parish wards to reflect our proposal for the areas surrounding Wigton Lane to comprise part of our proposed Alwoodley ward. We propose that Harewood & Wike and Wigton should continue to be represented by two and seven parish councillors respectively.

Draft recommendation

Harewood Parish Council should comprise nine parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards, Harewood & Wike and Wigton, returning two and seven parish councillors respectively. The boundary between the two parish wards should reflect the proposed city ward boundary, as illustrated and named on the large maps.

184 Otley Town Council is currently served by 15 parish councillors, representing five wards, Ashfield, Danefield, Manor, Prince Henry and West Chevin, each represented by three town councillors. Otley Town Council proposed modifications to its internal electoral arrangements to increase its town councillors and proposed an amendment to the existing boundary between Manor and West Chevin town wards to 'achieve more equality of representation' and to provide for a more identifiable boundary. Our proposed city warding arrangements would result in no change to this area and we are content to put forward the Town Council's proposal for consultation.

Draft recommendation

Otley Town Council should comprise 20 town councillors representing five wards: Ashfield (returning five councillors), Danefield (returning four councillors), Manor (returning four councillors), Prince Henry (returning three councillors) and West Chevin (returning four councillors), as illustrated and named on the large maps.

Map 2: Draft recommendations for Leeds

What happens next?

185 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Leeds contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 7 April 2003. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

186 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

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

Appendix A

Draft recommendations for Leeds: detailed mapping

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

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

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

Map A1: Draft recommendations for Leeds: key map

Appendix B

Code of Practice on Written Consultation

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

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

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

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