To whom it may concern,

Following the publication of the Commission's draft recommendations for the city of Preston, Preston City Council Conservative Group now submits and propose the following alterations.

Firstly, we note that the proposed recommendation by the council and the Labour Party to divide the existing ward of Lea and Cottam into two separate wards has been adopted by the Commission. We submit that this proposed change will have an adverse effect on the residents living within those communities.

In particular, we note that the draft proposals corrode community identity, disregard Lea and Cottam Parish Council and Ingol Neighbourhood Council, and presents too many varying local issues. This is diametrically opposed to the Commission's own statutory criteria, namely to preserve community identity, respect natural boundary lines, and provide effective and convenient local government.

Furthermore, we note the significant differences between Cottam and Ingol, and Lea and Larches, and submit that at present Lea and Cottam resides in the Fylde Constituency. Any proposed separation would lead to less effective and convenient local government as residents will have too many overlapping representatives. Whilst we note the Commission's reluctance to take into consideration the boundaries of either constituencies or other forms of local government, we note that parish councils are to be used as 'building blocks' when establishing new wards or modifying existing ones.

We re-submit that Lea and Cottam should remain whole and the additional housing within Summer Trees Avenue be included to achieve the required threshold for electoral equality. Additionally, we resubmit our original proposals for those wards in the west of Preston named Ingol, Ashton, and Tulketh as a more effective and convenient pattern of wards than those currently proposed. Please see the Conservatives 'Initial proposals for the new local government ward boundaries in Preston', page 11, and the accompanying map.

Secondly, we note the proposed name for the 'Tulketh' ward and submit that it is inappropriate. The communities within this ward are Wychnor, Ingol, and Cadley, with the inclusion of the Tulketh
Mill as a singular landmark. We propose that the ward name is changed to either Preston West or Wychnor and Cadley to better reflect the communities within this ward.

Third, we note the Commissions comments with respect to Rural East ward and their decision to use the parish and county division boundary as opposed to the M6 motorway. We submit that the area between the parish up until the M6 motorway contains only industrial units and should be included in the new Rural East ward as this reflects a more natural boundary line. Similarly, we submit that the wards of Garrison and Sharoe Green would benefit by following the M6 and M55 respectively as both represent better natural boundary lines.

In conclusion, whilst we note the Commission has adopted a number of recommendations put forward by the Conservative Group with regards to the first phase of consultation, we submit that there still remains a number of significant oversights which ought to be addressed prior to the final publication of new ward patterns in Preston.

To this end, we re-submit our original proposal titled ‘Initial proposals for the new local government ward boundaries in Preston’ together with this and ask that you reconsider your recommendations with the aforementioned alterations in mind.

Yours sincerely,

Preston City Council Conservative Group
Initial Conservative proposals for new local government ward boundaries in Preston
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The Conservative Party

This submission sets out the Conservative Party’s initial proposals for new local government ward boundaries in Preston.

Members of the Conservative Group are:

Cllr Neil Cartwright (Group Leader)
Cllr Damien Moore (Deputy Leader)

Cllr Susan Whittam  Cllr Trevor Hart
Cllr David Hammond  Cllr Christine Abram
Cllr Stephen Thompson  Cllr Daniel Dewhurst
Cllr Ron Woollam  Cllr Sonia Gildert
Cllr Lona Smith  Cllr David Walker
Cllr Rowena Edmonson  Cllr Margaret McManus
Cllr Roberta Cartwright  Cllr Stuart Greenhalgh
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For more information, contact:

Cllr Neil Cartwright (Leader)  Cllr.n.cartwright@preston.gov.uk
Cllr Daniel Dewhurst  Cllr.d.dewhurst@preston.gov.uk
Cllr Trevor Hart  Cllr.t.hart@preston.gov.uk
Cllr David Hammond  Cllr.d.hammond@preston.gov.uk
Summary

Preston Council has been allocated 48 ward councillors – a reduction of nine from the current number. Additionally, it has been noted that the council should move toward elections in thirds, whereby all local wards will have three councillors, as opposed to the current two and three members ward layout.

1 Due to the significant change required throughout the authority area, our proposals leave no ward unchanged.

2 As it has not always been possible to allocate whole communities within a single ward, we have attempted to group existing wards into wider-communities. The number of wards allocated to each wider-community has been determined by the geography of the area, its electorate, and any shared or common community interest. We also noted natural boundary lines and parished / neighbourhood areas.

3 Consequently, it has been necessary to propose some wards that cross Constituency and community boundaries. However, we have attempted to reduce conflicting interest so far as possible.

4 Additionally, we noted that the Council Officer proposal presented to Full Council on 18/05/2017 came as a result of the cross-party working groups deliberations over a six-month period. We also noted that the officer submission, although adequate, was not discussed by councillors due to the Labour Groups heavy political amendment.

5 Therefore, we submit that the previously proposed Officers proposal (see Appendix A) put forward to councillors at the meeting on 18/05/2017 be accepted by the Commission in respect to Ashton, Plungington, City Centre, Deepdale, St Matthews, and Fishwick & Frenchwood. However, we propose a number of minor changes in respect to wards in Fulwood, Preston West and Preston Rural. Although we have proposed Preston Central and Fulwood as separate wider-communities, we have proposed one ward that crosses the boundary, which combines polling districts from four currently existing wards.

6 In total, we propose 16 wards entirely contained in the authority of Preston – a reduction of six. Additionally, we propose all three-member wards and the postponement of elections in 2018.
Preston City Council set up a cross party working group to achieve a greater level of consensus between each of the political parties. All of whom were represented at each meeting.

1 Representatives met on a regular basis with officers to discuss proposals, and put forward their own ideas. Working collaboratively would hopefully determine a more consensual outcome, free from political bias.

2 The discussions were led by Ally Brown and Mike Molynuex who set out the broad principles from which to work and were attended by two members of the Labour Group, Conservative Group, one from the Liberal Party and the respective party leaders. In particular, it was emphasised that additional consideration should be given to the Commissions criteria, namely: electoral variance, natural boundary lines, and community interest/identity, whilst members were also minded to note the existing parished communities in the authority, which were to be used, where possible, as ‘building blocks’ when creating new wards.

3 As each political party put points forward, officers could take these into consideration, and amend where required to meet the guidance of the Boundary Commission. We noted that following this pattern of consultation; five submissions were created, demonstrating that the Officers listened to each political party fairly and impartially.

4 Although at the end of the discussions within the CPWG there appeared to be consensus on the proposal put forward by officers, the Labour Group decided that they would break with this in what was clearly a politically motivated counter-proposal at the last meeting. Due to their majority on Preston City Council they amended the officer proposal to their own which then became the Council’s proposal. Thus going against what had been agreed by all political parties. We noted that, due to the Labour Party’s actions, members did not discuss the Officers proposal in the Council chamber.

5 We noted that the leader of the Council, Cllr Peter Rankin (Labour), commented upon the decision by his political party by suggesting that the other political parties had not been open to cross-party talks. We regard this remark as completely nonsensical and submit the attached minutes from the cross-party working group, demonstrating that at every juncture, the Conservative Party in particularly highlighted a number of concerns.

6 On more than one occasion, Conservative representatives in the CPWG commented on the necessity to respect the parished boundaries, retain the Barracks in the Garrison ward due to it’s strong sense of community identity, and ensure Lea & Cottam retained its current boundary (with the Exception of polling district K). We also noted that Officers, and the Conservative and Liberal Parties showed strong opposition to the merging of Cottam and Ingol, which was regarded as unnecessarily political.
Furthermore, we noted that the Labour submission submitted by Cllr Rankin failed to improve the electoral variance proposed by Officers; in fact, the electoral variance of the Labour submission is significantly worse, whilst community identity and natural boundary lines are non-existent in most wards proposed.

Finally, the Labour Party has suggested that under their proposal, there is no ‘remainder ward’. We noted that the newly proposed Brookfield ward is completely inadequate and fails to represent community interest. The joining up of remaining polling districts from four currently existing wards evidences this.

Amendment: To defer the 2018 elections until 2019.

We note the amendment to the Councils submission to appeal to the Commission to defer the elections in 2018 until 2019. The Conservative Group supports this amendment and notes the financial and practical incentives for doing so.
Initial proposals for Preston

Preston City Council comprises all of the Constituency of Preston, half of the Wyre & Preston North Constituency, and a small segment of the Fylde constituency.

1 The Council currently has 22 wards, and of those wards, only 8 have electoral variances within 5% of the electoral quota. The electorates of 14 wards currently fall above the 5% limit, while the electorates of 6 constituencies are above 10% and an additional ward above 40%. Our initial proposals for Preston City Council are for 18 wards, a reduction of 4, in line with Commissions recommendation of a reduction to 48 councillors and elections in thirds.

2 In seeking to produce initial proposals for Preston City Council in which 18 wards, each with an electoral variance no greater than 10% of the electoral quota, could be proposed. We first considered whether, and how, the local authority polling areas could usefully be grouped into wider communities. We were mindful of seeking to respect, where we could, the external boundaries of identified communities. Our approach in attempting to group commonly identified areas together in wider-communities was based both on trying to respect community identities and parished/neighbourhood boundaries wherever possible and on achieving (where we could) obvious practical groupings such as those dictated in some part by the geography of the area.

3 Our division of Preston City Council into wider communities is a purely practical approach. We welcome the various proposals from residents and other political parties responding to the Commissions consultation, based on other groupings of wards and community identity, if the statutory factors can be better reflected in those counter-proposals. The distribution of electors across the four wider-communities and parished/neighbourhood areas of Preston is such that allocating a whole number of wards within wider-communities, which fall within 5% of the electoral quota, and avoiding dividing wards is not always possible.

4 Rural Preston’s electorate (Preston North & Preston East) of almost 9,200 results in an allocation of two wards. We have therefore considered rural Preston as a wider-community in its own right and have allocated two wards (no reduction). The electorate of Fulwood of just under 18,500 results in an allocation of 3.3 local government wards. We have therefore considered Fulwood as a wider-community in its own right and have allocated three whole wards, a reduction of two (Cadley and College). However, we have proposed one ward that crosses the wider-community boundary with Ingol (see below).

5 In the proposed ward of Preston West, the electorate at almost 5,000 results in an allocation of 1 ward. We considered that making proposals for a ward covering this area that respects parished council / neighbourhood council areas. But also attempted to minimise change to surrounding communities, would be the most ideal solution. With an entitlement to 0.9 wards, but with a rapidly growing population, we decided to consider Preston West as a separate entity requiring special consideration. We also decided to include a part of Larches ward (polling district K) in a
wider-community with Preston West; as we acknowledge that this will create a ward that crosses the boundary with Preston West.

6 We also noted that Preston Central, as a wider-community, had an electorate of almost 63,500, resulting in an allocation of 12 wards and therefore a reduction of 3. The previously existing wards of University, Moor Park and St George’s, all with significantly adverse variances, have been removed. We considered that Preston Central’s entitlement to 12.4 wards demonstrated that there could be no justification to propose a crossing of the boundary with Rural Preston and the unnecessary disruption that would be caused. We had already concluded that part of Larches should be considered with Preston West, and that the wards of Garrison, Sharoe Green, College, Cadley and Greyfriars should be considered as a wider-community of Fulwood, as there was likely to be greater shared interests and identity. The entitlements of both Fulwood and Preston Central suggest that it would be necessary for both wider-communities, given the adequate electoral variance in Rural Preston and Preston West, to contain at least one ward that cross the wider-community boundary. One ward, therefore, would combine the Wychnor community in Fulwood with the relatively similar polling districts JA, C, and V.
Amended proposals for Fulwood

There are currently five wards in Fulwood, only one of which has an electoral variance within the 5% electoral quota (College -17%; Garrison 8%; Greyfriars 6%; Sharoe Green -4%; and Cadley 10%). Fulwood is entitled to 3.57 wards, a reduction of two, and we considered that change to most of the wards would have to be significant. When developing our proposals we noted, despite the large geographical extent of Fulwood, our options would be limited due to the physical boundaries and the strong identity of local communities and natural boundary lines. Significant consideration was applied to the already existing Garrison Ward due to the Barracks and the necessity for one ward to cross wider-community boundaries. Additional consideration was given to existing two-member wards and the transition toward all three-member wards.

1. The electorate of the existing College ward at 2,929 (2023) is particularly low and needed to gain a significant number of electors to remain. We propose that the already existing Sharoe Green ward, which would have an adverse variance of -9% by 2023, is expanded to include the polling districts D and DA.

2. In order to increase the electorate of the Garrison ward we proposed that it should extend toward the southwest, as we consider that there are poor links between the existing communities of Garrison and the neighbouring Brookfield ward. We noted that the Garrison ward was within the 5% limit at 5,457. We therefore propose that the remaining polling district DC from the existing Sharoe Green ward be included. Apart from the small number of electors in polling district DA, this allows for the majority of Fulwood electors to the East of Preston Golf Course and north of Watling Street Road and the B6241 to be included in a single ward. Although we recognise that existing College and Garrison wards have their own identities, we considered that the natural link between polling district G, DB, and DC was preferable when considering community identities and effective representation. Additionally, this configuration would mean that the Barracks, an iconic building requiring of significant consideration, would continue to remain in the existing Garrison ward, which is a recognition of its importance and identity in the local community. In addition, we propose that this ward continue to be called Garrison.

3. In the West of Fulwood, the practicality of the existing Greyfriars and Cadley wards were particularly difficult to address. The above average electorate of the existing Greyfriars ward and the additional complexity of the two-member Cadley ward were such that we propose an entirely new ward be created and minor alterations to the existing Greyfriars ward be accepted. We decided that we could not maintain the separation of the two communities in different wards, because this would lead to a fundamental inconsistency in the redrawing of boundaries in Preston Central. Additionally, any alternative configuration would mean that a Fulwood ward would not meet the electoral quota.
4 Although the electorate of the existing Greyfriars ward is within the current permitted electoral range, our proposals in this area have resulted in it changing in order to accommodate changes elsewhere. We noted that the polling district H (Wychnor) was such that it stood alone when compared to the polling districts HA and HB and should therefore be removed and replaced with the Cadley polling district CA (Nooklands).

5 We consider that this allows for direct access via Black Bull Lane and the A6 from either end of the ward. We also noted that the railway would provide for a more natural boundary line and therefore propose that the Ingol Golf Course should be included in its entirety in the new Fulwood West ward (see below).

6 As a result of our proposed changes in Greyfriars, we proposed that a new ward, to be called Fulwood West, be created from the existing polling districts H, C, V, and JA respectively. Although it was noted that this did result in the division of the Ingol community, in view of the urban density and very close proximity of numerous community identities in Fulwood West (Cadley, Ingol, Greyfriars, and Tulketh), it was considered that some division of communities would be unavoidable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greyfriars/Ingol/Cadley/Tulketh</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts H, JA, C,V (Follows a natural line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Railway could be used to straighten line if wished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greyfriars/Cadley</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>+184</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Polling Districts HA, HB, C (Present ward less H but includes C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>+455</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>Polling Districts G, GA, GB, DB, DC (Current Garrison plus DB &amp;DC from College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sharoe Green/College</td>
<td>6,473</td>
<td>+206</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Polling Districts R, RA, RB, D, DA (Current Sharoe Green ward plus D &amp; DA from College)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amended proposals for Preston Rural

There are currently two wards in this wider-community. We decided to review Preston Rural as an entity without the inclusion of Preston West, which we proposed to be considered individually. Excluding Preston West, Preston Rural has an entitlement to 2.3 wards.

1 We noted that the electorate of the existing Preston East ward at 4,224 had to increase due to the current two-member system. The only way this could be achieved practically, and within the rural community, would be to include the polling districts OOWL and OOWH. Our proposal would mean that the currently existing ward of Preston North, with an electorate at 7,978 – a 51% variance - would be significantly reduced to fall within a plausible variance of the electoral quota.

2 Our proposals would mean that the parished communities of Grimsargh, Whittingham, Barton, Woodplumton, Broughton, and Goosnargh, which otherwise would have to be divided in any proposal that did not cross the wider-rural community, could be wholly contained within either ward. We also considered that this would allow for a reduction in the geographical size of Rural North ward, which was considered to be too large in its current form.

3 Our proposals elsewhere in Preston Rural would mean that Preston East would expand toward the M6 motorway, including the polling districts BD and PC (only up to the M6). We noted that these additional polling districts include no additional residence, only industrial estate, but would create a natural boundary line.

4 Additionally, we submit that both wards continue to be named Preston North and Preston East respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preston Rural North</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>-361</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Polling Districts OOGW, OOGS, OOB, OOWC, OOWP (Current ward less OOWL &amp; OOWH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preston Rural East</td>
<td>6,295</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts OOWH, OOWL, NNBA, NNB, NNG, NNG1 (Current ward plus OOWL &amp; OOWH) Boundary moved to follow motorway, no real impact on residential and optional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Amended proposals for Preston West

In the west of the City we propose that the existing Lea ward, which required a marginal increase in electors, would be unchanged apart from the inclusion of polling district K (Larches). We consider that this will protect the Parished area of Lea & Cottam and provide effective representation in an area faced with significant house building in future years and a dramatic increase in electors by 2023.

1 Under the Labour Party’s proposal, we noted that the ward of Lea & Cottam was unnecessarily dismantled with a lack of credible evidence. As a result, the parishes of Lea & Cottam and the Ingol and neighbourhood council would be dislocated and correspondingly, strong community identity lost. We believe that this represents a completely politically motivated division within Preston communities by the Labour Party.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lea/Cottam</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts L, LA, LB, K (Current ward plus K (Summer Trees Avenue which is entered off Lea Road)) Note Lea Town is entered from Cottam ward so needs to be with Cottam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amended proposals for Preston Central

There are currently 18 wards in Preston Central, four of which have an electoral variance outside the 10% electoral quota (Ashton -11%; Moor Park -13%; Riversway -23%; and University -45%). Additionally, 7 wards have a variance between 5-10% of the electoral quota (Deepdale 9%; Larches 7%; Ribbleton 9%; St George’s -6%; St Matthews -6%; Town Centre 7%; and Tulketh -7%). Preston Central is entitled to 11.04 wards, a reduction of seven, and we considered that there would have to be significant reductions in most wards to compensation for a significant variance in a large number of existing wards.

1 When developing our proposals to the Commission we noted that, despite the significant alterations made by the Labour Group to the Councils own proposal, the Officers submission represented an efficient form of local government and proposed a pattern of wards which reflected the statutory criteria, namely community identity, natural boundaries lines, and fairness in the electoral variance. Therefore, we submit that the previously proposed Officers proposal (see Appendix A) put forward to councillors at the meeting on 18/05/2017 be accepted by the Commission in respect to Ashton, Plungington, City Centre, Deepdale, St Matthews, and Fishwick & Frenchwood. However, we propose the following changes in respect to a number of wards proposed.

2 As previously discussed, we propose that the ward named ‘Garrison’ under the officers proposals be amended to reflect the well-established community identity. We noted that, under the current proposals, the Barracks – an iconic and historically important Preston landmark had been removed Garrison ward. We consider this to be an oversight and a poor reflection of community identity in Fulwood with significant implications for Preston Central wards. Additionally we submit that the inclusion of polling district B, would lead to an unnecessary combination of community identity, as the two communities are too dissimilar.

3 We propose that the currently existing ward of Garrison be expanded to include residents in polling districts DB and DC, which have for a long period of time, recognised themselves as living in Fulwood not Brookfield.

4 Juxtaposed, the existing Brookfield ward would require additional polling districts to bring its electorate to within the electoral quota. We have already proposed that it should lose the polling districts, G, GA, and DC To Garrison, so we proposed the inclusion of the following three polling districts: B, BC, BD (up to the M6), and P from the Officers proposed ward of Ribbleton. Additionally, we propose that the ward retain the name Brookfield.

5 In view of the Officer proposals, we considered the newly created Ingol / Larches ward needed to be widened to appear more natural. We dismiss the Labour Groups argument that these communities are too dissimilar and unable to merge. We submit that this ward should include the entirety of Haslam Park and all residential buildings north of Blackpool Road and to the west of Woodplumpton Road in polling district A respectively. In doing so, we submit that this ward would become more natural and in line with community identity. We noted that both areas have identified as being similar in the past, whilst both have been linked due to the existing park area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fishwick &amp; Frenchwood</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Polling Districts F, FA, UB, UD and UE. Maintain the communities of Fishwick within the Inner East Preston area linked to the community of Frenchwood while providing elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ribbleton</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>-460</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Polling Districts PA, PB, PB1, PC, PD, PE PF and FB. Retains the existing ward of Ribbleton (not including P) with the additional area of a small part of Fishwick ward to the east of the New Hall Lane / Blackpool Road junction. Large degree of community identity while providing for elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St Matthews</td>
<td>6,037</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts T, TA TB, TC, TD and SB. Retains St Matthews ward in its entirety with a small area of St Georges. Electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polling Districts U, UA, UC, WA, QB, QC and QD. City Centre area with part of the University area. Provides for electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Polling Districts A, AA, KC, Q and QA. Community of Ashton and community of Larches, with relatively small population along Riversway in western inner suburbs of Preston. Close as possible to elector equality. 100 electors has been removed to compensate for the adoption by Ingol and Larches ward of households north of Blackpool Road and west of Woodplumton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ingol</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Polling Districts J, JB, KA and KB. Parts of current Ingol and Larches wards in western suburbs of Preston. A linked community through the road and green space network with electoral equality. These figures do not accurately include the additional electors to the north of Blackpool Road and West of Woodplumton Road in polling district A. For the benefit of this submission, however, we have provided for an additional 100 electors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Plungington</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polling Districts VA, VB, W, S, M and MA. North inner suburban area with an identity around the Plungington area close to electoral equality. All west of A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deepdale</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>-278</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts E, EA, MB and SA. Existing Deepdale ward area with additional areas to the west. Broadly similar community but all to east of A6. Provides electoral equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>5,955</td>
<td>-340</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Polling Districts B, BA, BB, BC, BD, AND P. Existing Brookfield ward are with additional areas to the East and South, including the residential area (up until the M6) in polling district BD and the polling district P from Ribbleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Members and Officers of The Council

Dear Sir/Madam

Extraordinary Council - 18 May 2017

You are requested to attend a meeting of the Council to be held on Thursday, 18th May, 2017 at 3.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Preston.

The business to be transacted at the meeting is set out in the Agenda overleaf.

Disclosure of Interests

In addition could I please draw your attention to Item No. 1 on the Agenda which relates to the need to declare any personal/prejudicial interest or disclosable pecuniary interest (which is not included in the register of interests).

As you know the process of making declarations at the meeting of Council is a statutory requirement, however, it can sometimes be time consuming during the meeting. Therefore it would be helpful in speeding up the progress of the meeting if Members would notify Julie Grundy in writing or by email of an interest(s) they need to declare in the light of the contents of the agenda prior to the day of the meeting. Could Members also indicate the nature of the interest, whether it is a disclosable pecuniary interest, Personal (and/or Prejudicial), and to which item on the agenda it relates.

A list of interests to be declared will be on deposit at the meeting. It is then proposed that the Mayor, in introducing Item No. 1, will indicate that these notifications are taken as declarations for the purposes of the requirements of the Code of Conduct for Members.
If Members fail to notify any declarations in advance they will have to make verbal declarations at the meeting but it is hoped this can be avoided. If a Member requires general advice on declarations of interest, he/she is advised to contact Julie Grundy, Caron Parmenter or Lorraine Norris.

**NB. Please note that a professional version of the map, set out in Appendix B to Item 2, will be published shortly and large hard copy versions will be able to be viewed in the Council Chamber at the meeting.**

Yours faithfully

*Ally Brown*

*Director of Corporate Services*

---

N.B. In the event that a meeting is being webcast and the Council resolves to exclude the press and public (Part B) during proceedings, the Mayor must read the exclusion paragraph in full, and it be accepted by the Council, before allowing officers time to stop the webcast.
Council
Thursday, 18 May 2017

Agenda

Part A (Open to Press and Public)

1. Declarations of Interests

   To receive any declarations of interest from Members.

Matters for Decision

2. Electoral Review of Warding Patterns (Pages 1 - 8)

   Report enclosed.
1. **Summary**

1.1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is currently carrying out an Electoral Review of the number of wards and ward boundaries for Preston City Council.

1.2 As part of this process the LGBCE have asked for submissions proposing warding patterns. Any group or individual is able to put forward suggestions for all or part of the City.

1.3 The LGBCE will run a ten-week consultation on proposed warding patterns before it publishes its final recommendations. Boundaries will be changed following the laying down of an Order in Parliament and will take effect for Preston City Council from the next ordinary elections in May 2019.

2. **Decision Required**

2.1 To approve the proposed warding pattern and ward names for Preston City as set out at Appendix A; and

2.2 To authorise the Director of Corporate Services to finalise and submit the Council’s response to the LGBCE consultation on warding patterns, in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

3. **Information**

3.1 The LGBCE is carrying out an Electoral Review of the City. It has recently finished its consultation on the size of the Council and has determined that the City of Preston should have 48 Members.

3.2 The Commission has now asked for submissions proposing warding patterns that reflect this change.
3.3 In preparing its submission proposing new ward arrangements for the City the Council must take account of:

- **Delivering electoral equality for local voters** – this means ensuring that each local Councillor represents roughly the same number of people so that the value of an individual’s vote is the same regardless of where they live in the area of the City.

- **Reflecting the interests and identities of local communities** – this means establishing electoral arrangements which, as far as possible, maintain local ties and where boundaries are easily identifiable.

- **Promoting effective and convenient local government** – this means ensuring that the new wards or electoral divisions can be represented effectively by their elected representative(s) and that the new electoral arrangements as a whole allow the City Council to conduct its business effectively. In addition, the pattern of wards need to reflect the electoral cycle of Council. The law states that where a Council hold elections in three years out of every four where a third of Councillors are elected at each election (“by thirds”) the Council should seek to deliver a pattern of three-Member wards across a district.

3.4 The Council has an established Officer and Member Working Group which has met on several occasions to help and inform the review. Using maps, the group identified key communities within the City. It also took into account any man-made or natural barriers such as major roads, rivers and water courses that acted as boundaries between communities.

3.5 The LGBCE have asked for current electoral statistics and forecasts at polling district level 2017 – 2023 which need to be underpinned by sound evidence. The Council needs to consider the impact of likely housing and economic developments, expected migration into, out of and within the City, and the expected difference between the number of adults in an area’s population and the number of electors.

3.6 Based on a Council size of 48 and growth projections, the projected electorate in 2023 is 100,295 which means the average number of electors for each Councillor is 2,089.

3.7 The table provided at Appendix A provides a summary of proposed warding arrangements and the figures in support. It is felt that these proposals would reflect the community identities and interests of the area whilst ensuring that the proposals would deliver electoral equality. This has resulted in some changes to the ward names to support the recommendations which have been proposed. A copy of the map showing the proposed new ward boundaries and ward names is also enclosed at Appendix B.

3.8 This review is for local government ward boundaries and is not in any way connected to the separate Parliamentary constituency boundary review which is currently being undertaken by the Boundary Commission for England (BCE).

3.9 Further details about this electoral review and the Commission can be found at [www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk). Comments can be made by post to the LGBCE,
4. **Implications**

4.1 **Legal Implications**

4.1.1 Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the electoral arrangements for every principal authority must be reviewed from time to time.

4.1.2 If the Council does not produce an initial submission, the LGBCE will impose its recommendations for the future electoral arrangements within the City. It is therefore in the Council’s best interests to make an initial submission which reflects the Council’s requirements.

4.2 **Financial Implications**

4.2.1 This is an external review and the LGBCE is responsible for any expenditure incurred.

4.2.2 All out elections in 2019 will incur the Council some additional costs to those previously anticipated and budget for. These will be addressed as and when they occur.

5. **Impact Statement**

5.1 (i) **Services Users** - The external review should have a positive impact on the citizens of Preston.

(ii) **Council Plans and Services** – This is an external review conducted by the LGBCE and has no impact on Council Plans and Services.

(iii) **Fair Employment / Living Wage** – N/A

(iv) **Equality Impacts of Services Changes / New Services** – The review is conducted by the LGBCE and as such they are responsible for ensuring any equality, diversity, cohesion and integration issues are identified and addressed as part of the review process.

6. **Reason for Inclusion in Part B, if Appropriate**

6.1 N/A
**Background Documents:**

Background documents open to inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contact/Directorate/Ext</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contact for further information:**

Lorraine Norris  906101  Chief Executive
Proposed Warding Arrangements

The table below shows how the proposed Warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward / Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation from average (6,268)</th>
<th>Percent variation</th>
<th>Evidence and rationale that the proposals meet the three statutory criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston Rural North</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>-361</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Current ward less polling districts OOWL &amp; OOWH (Whittingham) which are reallocated to Preston Rural East ward. This change takes account of new housing development in the west of the ward to equalise electorate, whilst ensuring that the community of Whittingham retains its identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Rural East</td>
<td>6,295</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Current ward plus polling districts OOWL &amp; OOWH (Whittingham) from Preston Rural North. Reasons as above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyfriars</td>
<td>6451</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polling districts HA, HB and CA form an area to the east of the west coast mainline and west of the A6 through the suburban area of North Preston (Fulwood area). Part of HB’s western boundary extends over the railway line and could be amended to follow the hard boundary formed by the line without significant impact on electoral equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulketh</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts H, JA, C and V. This ward is west of the Greyfriars ward, and the west coast mainline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lea</td>
<td>6262</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts L, LA, LB and K. This ward arrangement provides for the Lea parish area to be retained within one ward while ensuring elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishwick &amp; Frenchwood</td>
<td>6211</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Polling Districts F, FA, UB, UD and UE. Maintains the communities of Fishwick within the Inner East Preston area linked to the community of Frenchwood while providing elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbleton</td>
<td>6478</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polling Districts P, PA, PB, PB1, PC, PD, PE PF and FB. Retains the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing ward of Ribbleton with the additional area of a small part of Fishwick ward to the east of the New Hall Lane / Blackpool Road junction. Large degree of community identity while providing for elector equality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Polling Districts</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Matthews</td>
<td>6037</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts T, TA TB, TC, TD and SB. Retains St Matthews ward in its entirety with a small area of St Georges. Electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>6316</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polling Districts U, UA, UC, WA, QB, QC and QD. City Centre area with part of the University area. Provides for electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>6694</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Polling Districts A, AA, KC, Q and QA. Community of Ashton and community of Larches, with relatively small population along Riversway in western inner suburbs of Preston. Close as possible to elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plungington</td>
<td>6785</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polling Districts VA, VB, W, S, M and MA. North inner suburban area with an identity around the Plungington area close to electoral equality. All west of A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepdale</td>
<td>5990</td>
<td>-278</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts E, EA, MB and SA. Existing Deepdale ward area with additional areas to the west. Broadly similar community but all to east of A6. Provides electoral equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharoe Green</td>
<td>6472</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Polling Districts R, RA, RB, D and DA. Existing Sharoe Green ward with additional part of College. North West suburbs to east of A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>5930</td>
<td>-338</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Polling Districts DC, DB, G, GA, BA, BB, AND BC. Parts of the populated area of the Brookfield area with additions from existing Garrison and College wards. Elector equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>6125</td>
<td>-143</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>Polling Districts GB, B and BD. Parts of Garrison and Brookfield wards in western suburbs of Preston.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Member and Officer Boundary Review Group Meeting
10.00 am, 13 April 2017

Present: Councillors Rankin, N Cartwright, Potter, Rollo, Saksena, Hart and Dewhurst

Also in Attendance:

- Ms A Brown - Director of Corporate Services
- Ms C Parmenter - Head of Legal and Democratic Services
- Mr M Molyneux - Head of Planning Policy & Housing Strategy
- Mr P Welsh - Head of Electoral Services
- Mrs C Standring - Senior Electoral Services Officer
- Ms J Grundy - Head of Member Services

Apologies: Councillor Mrs Brown

Electoral Review Warding Patterns

Ally Brown, the Director of Corporate Services gave an introduction to the item to consider electoral warding patterns. She said that Mike Molyneux, Head of Planning Policy & Housing Strategy, had made a first attempt at the boundary ward review taking into account the statutory criteria to:

- Deliver electoral equality;
- Reflect the interests and identities of local communities; and
- Provide for effective and convenient local government.

Ally Brown reminded Members that anyone, including individuals, could make submissions to the Boundary Commission and the timeline for the Council to submit its submission to the Commission was 5 June 2017. As such, Ally advised that an Extraordinary meeting of full Council would have to be held after the conclusion of Annual Council on 18 May to consider the final report prior to submission to the Boundary Commission.

Ally said that in Mike’s first draft he has used, as instructed to do so by the Commission, the project figures for 2023. Furthermore, Ally said that no names for wards had been suggested but they had been numbered and referred to within the descriptions. Ally also said that no political sensitivities had been taken into account when Mike had drawn up the first draft. She then encouraged further suggestions following Mike’s presentation as long as they took into account the three elements of the statutory criteria.

Mike Molyneux then set out his presentation. He distributed copies of the polling districts which detailed the first draft proposals as well as a list providing information on the suggested changes.
Mike said that as well as adhering to the statutory criteria, detailed above, the Boundary Commission had stated that only a variance of +/- 10% in each ward would be acceptable. He said that he had managed to reduce the number of wards from 22 to 16 based on three Members in each ward and he took the Group through the reasons for each of his draft proposals.

On proposal No. 5, Ashton/Riversway, on the paper circulated, the Leader suggested that polling district KC could be swapped with KB in Lea/Larchs. Alternatively he said that KA and KB in Lea/Larchs be swapped for KC in Ashton/Riversway? Mike said that KA and KB would match KC and said there was leeway within these areas to get nearer to the balance required.

Councillor Potter asked if splitting polling districts was a last resort to which Mike responded that he was trying to avoid it. The Leader supported the view too. Councillor Saksena suggested that the only time where that would possibly be considered was where there was one heavy ward and a light one.

Mike said that No.6 and 7 on the paper, Ingol/Greyfriars and Greyfriars/Cadley respectively, was changed from the existing arrangement but that the main train line was an obvious boundary for these wards.

With regards to the existing Garrison ward, No.9 on the paper, Mike was suggesting a minimal change in that a small enclave from College ward moves into the current Garrison ward which would take the variance up to 10%.

Mike referred to No.10 Brookfield/Ribbleton and said that there may be a bit of tweaking possible in this area. He said that in effect the current Ribbleton ward disappears as it is split between wards. The Leader said that to put wards who were already struggling with an additional 10% variance was unfair. Mike said that he could look again at No.10, 11 and 12 to see if he could do anything i.e. potentially move PA into St Matthews which may equal things out slightly.

No.12 Ribbleton/St Matthews/Deepdale, Mike said that this area already had an established Neighbourhood Plan plus a community group with Friends of Fishwick and St Matthews. Therefore, he would have to look at the area carefully. He said the area had clearly identifiable areas and the work which had been done on New Hall Lane had brought the community together further.

Mike then said he would have maps drawn up properly and would circulate them to all Members.

Ally said that an Extraordinary full Council meeting would be required to consider the Council’s submission to the Boundary Commission to meet their deadline of 5 June 2017. She suggested holding the meeting immediately after the Annual Council meeting on 18 May 2017 which would mean that due to Access to Information Rules the agenda and reports would be required to be published on 8 May 2017.

The Leader suggested that Ally contact the Boundary Commission again to request an additional weeks grace due to the forthcoming by-elections and County elections.
However, in the meantime Members were asked to consider the information they had received from Mike and get any further proposals to him as soon as possible. As a result, any plan remodelling of the wards would then be shared all groups to enable open and fair discussions to take place.

Mike said he was on leave from 8 May and with the agenda being required to be published on that date, it was suggested that a meeting be held on Friday 28 April to consider further suggestions and potentially a draft report. Ally confirmed that she would put the date in Members’ calendars. She also requested that Members give thought as to what they would wish to call the wards as this would form part of the Council’s submission.

Meeting finished: 10.52 am.
Member and Officer Boundary Review Group Meeting
9.30 am, 28 April 2017

Present: Councillors Rankin, N Cartwright, Mrs Brown, Rollo, Saksena, Hart and Dewhurst

Also In Attendance:

- Ms A Brown - Director of Corporate Services
- Ms C Parmenter - Head of Legal and Democratic Services
- Mr M Molyneux - Head of Planning Policy & Housing Strategy
- Mr P Welsh - Head of Electoral Services
- Ms J Grundy - Head of Member Services

Electoral Review Warding Patterns – Follow up

Ally Brown, the Director of Corporate Services, opened the meeting and said that whilst options on warding patterns would be shared there was nothing preventing an individual making their own submission direct to the Boundary Commission (BC). She said that the last time the Review Group met it had looked at three key drivers set out by the BC when looking at Ward options, namely, to deliver electoral equality, reflect the interests and identities of local communities and to provide for effective and convenient local government and it seemed that the priority for the BC was in particular electoral equality.

Mike Molyneux, the Head of Planning Policy and Housing Strategy, had developed five options for consideration, however option four had since been deleted. Mike said that he had maps for all other options and he would explain what they were, although he said Members had already seen three of them.

Ally explained that the maps developed had evolved from what Members had previously told officers and said that she would like to see if there could be consensus on some areas.

Mike confirmed that option one, the original draft which had been seen by all members of the group, could now be discounted as option two was a variation of option one and ironed out the 10% differences. Option three was derived from going East to West of the City, excluding the Rural Wards on which Mike said there seemed to be a degree of agreement. Mike had received schedules from both the Conservative and Labour Groups and option five was drawn up taking into account the common ground from both submissions. Mike circulated a map and spreadsheet setting out the proposed option five. He said that there were four wards in common:

- Preston Rural North
- Preston Rural East
- Greyfriars
- Cadley

Either side of the West
Coast train line.
Mike said that the difficulty in option five (number 11 – Ingol/Larches) was that there was a pinch point which needed to be looked at. Within option five he had also taken into account the community in Lea and Cottam and had retained Ribbleton in its entirety. Additionally he had taken Fishwick down New Hall Lane and mixed it with Frenchwood. Moor Park was also split at Deepdale Road which was a natural divide and that was the last of the major issues to report. Mike accepted that ward 15 (College/Garrison/Brookfield) was an odd shaped ward, however it was a difficult process.

Regarding the polling districts, Mike said that he had tried to maintain them in their entirety and he suggested that the time to reconfigure polling districts would be at the next census in 2021.

The Leader then asked if the Review Group wanted to share their submissions with each other.

Ally said that from the first meeting officers had addressed option one by taking into account all comments made at the previous meeting which had led officers to producing option five. She said it was not an easy task to do but in all cases the polling districts had remained intact. Ally welcomed Members discussing all options before them. She advised that if no agreement could be reached at the meeting that a report from officers would be submitted to the Extraordinary Council meeting scheduled for 18 May 2017 whereby it would then be up to Council to decide what to submit to the BC.

The Review Group adjourned for five minutes to allow the Conservative group to consider disclosing their submission.

Councillor Hart said that the Conservative group would not be disclosing its submission as more work was required taking on board the details on option five circulated at the meeting. He said it was noted that there were many differences between option three and option five and therefore it would not add much value to disclose the Conservative option pending consideration of the new information.

Councillor N Cartwright requested that larger copies of the plans pertaining to option five be circulated to each Group Leader and Mike confirmed that he would provide copies. Mike confirmed that he would also circulate a schedule of option five to Members.

The Leader displayed a copy of the Labour Group’s proposed submission for consideration by the Review Group and he agreed to email the map out to other Group Leaders. The Leader said that his group were happy with Preston Rural North and Preston Rural East, however he had difficulty with Greyfriars. He also confirmed that it had been recognised that Ingol should belong with Cottam as there was a distinct relationship with polling districts KA and KC. The Leader said that splitting polling district K put the Western side into Cottam and the East in to Larches and there was a very clear rationale for it.

Councillor Dewhurst said that the Conservative view was that polling districts J and JB in Ingol were completely separate communities and the Leader agreed with that
view which also divided the Neighbourhood Council. Councillor Hart said that it not only divided the Neighbourhood Council but the Parish Council too.

Councillor Rollo said that the Labour Group had split Ingol almost 50/50 and Mike confirmed that the only polling districts proposed to be split by the Labour Group were GA and K. Ally said that any polling districts suggested to be split should be looked at to consider if they are balanced taking into account the community element of the proposals.

Ally reiterated that officers would look at the BC guidelines with the emphasis being on electoral equality. She also confirmed that officers had spoken to other authorities who had recently undergone boundary reviews. Ally proposed that officers take on board comments made by Members at the meeting and see if the officer group had any changes to make before sharing with Members of the Review Group. She said that it was probable that a report would be submitted to Council with an officer recommendation which could then be amended at Council and voted on accordingly, following debate. Whilst the situation was not ideal it was felt necessary in this case if an agreement could not be reached.

Councillor Rankin said the process had been a difficult one with some Members being unhappy with proposals. Councillor N Cartwright said that much work had been done by all groups and whilst each group was not going to agree, it was acknowledged where the contentious areas were.

Ally thanked Members for their attendance and input and advised that she would keep all Members of the Review Group informed as to what would be put forward as the officers’ submission to Council as well as providing the timeline for consultations and submissions for the ongoing process. She also praised officers for their input, particularly Mike Molyneux who had been burning the midnight oil and devoting his weekends to devising proposals for consideration.

Meeting finished: 10.50 am
# Annex C: Electoral variance grid

(Conservative submission)

## Fulwood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Greyfriars/Ingol/Cadley/Tulketh</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts H, JA, C, V (Follows a natural line) (Railway could be used to straighten line if wished)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greyfriars/Cadley</td>
<td>6,451</td>
<td>+184</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Polling Districts HA, HB, C (Present ward less H but includes C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>+455</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>Polling Districts G, GA, GB, DB, DC (Current Garrison plus DB &amp; DC from College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sharoe Green/College</td>
<td>6,473</td>
<td>+206</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>Polling Districts R, RA, RB, D, DA (Current Sharoe Green ward plus D &amp; DA from College)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Preston Rural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preston Rural North</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>-361</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>Polling Districts OOGW, OOGS, OOB, OOWC, OOWP (Current ward less OOWL &amp; OOWH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preston Rural East</td>
<td>6,295</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts OOWH, OOWL, NNBA, NNBB, NNG, NNG1 (Current ward plus OOWL &amp; OOWH) Boundary moved to follow motorway, no real impact on residential and optional.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Preston West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lea/Cottam</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Polling Districts L, LA, LB, K (Current ward plus K (Summer Trees Avenue which is entered off Lea Road) Note Lea Town is entered from Cottam ward so needs to be with Cottam)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial Conservative proposals for new local government ward boundaries in Preston
### Preston Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ward/Area</th>
<th>Electorate</th>
<th>Variation Average</th>
<th>Percent Variation</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fishwick &amp; Frenchwood</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Polling Districts F, FA, UB, UD and UE. Maintain the communities of Fishwick within the Inner East Preston area linked to the community of Frenchwood while providing elector equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ribbleton</td>
<td>5,835</td>
<td>-460</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>Polling Districts PA, PB, PB1, PC, PD, PE PF and FB. Retains the existing ward of Ribbleton (not including P) with the additional area of a small part of Fishwick ward to the east of the New Hall Lane / Blackpool Road junction. Large degree of community identity while providing for elector equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>St Matthews</td>
<td>6,037</td>
<td>-231</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts T, TA TB, TC, TD and SB. Retains St. Matthews ward in its entirety with a small area of St Georges. Electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City Centre</td>
<td>6,316</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Polling Districts U, UA, UC, WA, QB, QC and QD. City Centre area with part of the University area. Provides for electoral equality and community identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ashton</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Polling Districts A, AA, KC, Q and QA. Community of Ashton and community of Larches, with relatively small population along Riversway in western inner suburbs of Preston. Close as possible to elector equality. 100 electors has been removed to compensate for the adoption by Ingol and Larches ward of households north of Blackpool Road and west of Woodplumton Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ingol</td>
<td>5,995</td>
<td>-73</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>Polling Districts J, JB, KA and KB. Parts of current Ingol and Larches wards in western suburbs of Preston. A linked community through the road and green space network with electoral equality. These figures do not accurately include the additional electors to the north of Blackpool Road and West of Woodplumton Road in polling district A. For the benefit of this submission, however, we have provided for an additional 100 electors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Plungington</td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Polling Districts VA, VB, W, S, M and MA. North inner suburban area with an identity around the Plungington area close to electoral equality. All west of A6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deepdale</td>
<td>5,990</td>
<td>-278</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Polling Districts E, EA, MB and SA. Existing Deepdale ward area with additional areas to the west. Broadly similar community but all to east of A6. Provides electoral equality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>5,955</td>
<td>-340</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>Polling Districts B, BA, BB, BC, BD, AND P. Existing Brookfield ward are with additional areas to the East and South, including the residential area (up until the M6) in polling district BD and the polling district P from Ribbleton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex D: New ward boundaries (Conservative submission)
Annex E: New ward boundaries (Boundary Commission submission)