

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
the City of Lancaster

April 2000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

The Local Government Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament. Our task is to review and make recommendations to the Government on whether there should be changes to the structure of local government, the boundaries of individual local authority areas, and their electoral arrangements.

Members of the Commission are:

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

Barbara Stephens (Chief Executive)

We are statutorily required to review periodically the electoral arrangements – such as the number of councillors representing electors in each area and the number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions – of every principal local authority in England. In broad terms our objective 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, and the number of councillors and ward names. We can also make recommendations for change to the electoral arrangements of parish and town councils in the district.

This report sets out the Commission's draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the City of Lancaster.

© Crown Copyright 2000

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

CONTENTS

	page
SUMMARY	<i>v</i>
1 INTRODUCTION	<i>1</i>
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	<i>5</i>
3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED	<i>9</i>
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>11</i>
5 NEXT STEPS	<i>29</i>
APPENDICES	
A Draft Recommendations for Lancaster: Detailed Mapping	<i>31</i>
B Lancaster City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>35</i>
C The Statutory Provisions	<i>39</i>

A large map illustrating the existing and proposed ward boundaries for Lancaster and Morecambe is inserted inside the back cover of the report.

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Lancaster on 7 September 1999.

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

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

- **in 15 of the 28 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the district and six wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is not expected to improve, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in 16 wards and by more than 20 per cent in six wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 108-109) are that:

- **Lancaster City Council should have 60 councillors, as at present;**
- **there should be 28 wards, one less than at present;**
- **the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, and three wards should retain their existing boundaries;**
- **elections for the whole council should continue to take place every four years.**

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

- **The number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average in all the proposed wards, both initially and by 2004.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for Carnforth Town Council and the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands, Ellel, Heaton-with-Oxcliffe and Scotforth.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 4 April 2000. Because we take this consultation very seriously, we may move away from our draft recommendations in the light of Stage Three responses. 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 and then make our final recommendations to the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions.**
- **It will then be for the Secretary of State to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. He will also determine when any changes come into effect.**

You should express your views by writing directly to the Commission at the address below by 5 June 2000:

**Review Manager
Lancaster Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU**

**Fax: 020 7404 6142
E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk
Website: www.lgce.gov.uk**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
1	Bolton-le-Sands	2	Bolton-le-Sands ward (part – the proposed Bolton-le-Sands North parish ward) Carnforth ward (part – the proposed Crag Band town council ward)	Map 2 and large map
2	Bulk	3	Bulk ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
3	Carnforth	2	Carnforth ward (part – the proposed Carnforth Town town council ward)	Map 2 and map A2
4	Castle	3	Castle ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
5	Duke's	1	Bulk ward (part); Castle ward (part); John O'Gaunt ward (part); Scotforth West ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
6	Ellel	2	Ellel ward (the parishes of Cockerham, Ellel (part – the parish wards of Ellel North and South) and Thurnham; Caton ward (part – the parishes of Scotforth and Over Wyresdale)	Map 2 and large map
7	Halton-with-Aughton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Halton-with-Aughton	Map 2
8	Heysham Sandylands	2	Alexandra ward (part); Heysham Central ward (part); Heysham North ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
9	Heysham The Cliffs	2	Heysham Central ward (part); Heysham South ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
10	Higher Heysham	3	Heysham South ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
11	John O'Gaunt	3	John O'Gaunt ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
12	Kellet	1	Kellet ward (the parishes of Borwick, Nether Kellet, Over Kellet and Priest Hutton); Arkholme ward (part – the parish of Arkholme-with-Cawood)	Map 2
13	Lune Valley North	1	Arkholme ward (part – the parishes of Burrow-with-Burrow, Cantsfield, Ireby, Leck, Melling-with-Wrayton and Tunstall); Hornby ward (part – the parishes of Claughton, Hornby-with-Farleton, and Gressingham)	Map 2
14	Lune Valley South	2	Hornby ward (part – the parishes of Wennington, Tatham, Roeburn, Wray-with-Botton); Caton ward (part – the parishes of Caton-with-Littledale and Quernmore)	Map 2
15	Overton	1	Overton ward (part – the Rural parish ward of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe, Middleton and Overton); Heysham South ward (part)	Map 2 and large map

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Map reference
16	Parks	2	Parks ward (part); Poulton ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
17	Poulton	3	Poulton ward (part); Victoria (part)	Map 2 and large map
18	Scotforth East	2	Scotforth East ward (part)	Map 2
19	Scotforth West	3	Scotforth West ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
20	Silverdale	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parishes of Sliverdale, Yeland Conyers and Yeland Redmayne	Map 2
21	Skerton East	3	Skerton East ward; Skerton Central ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
22	Skerton West	3	Overton ward (part – the parish ward of Winsters Park); Skerton West ward (part); Skerton Central ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
23	Slyne-with-Hest	2	Bolton-le-Sands ward (part – the parish ward of Bolton-le-Sands South); Slyne-with-Hest ward	Map 2
24	Torrisholme	3	Overton ward (part – the proposed Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Torrisholme parish ward); Parks ward (part); Torrisholme ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
25	University	2	Ellel ward (part – the proposed Ellel University parish ward); Scotforth East ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
26	Warton	1	<i>Unchanged</i> – the parish of Warton	Map 2
27	West End	3	Alexandra ward (part); Harbour ward (part)	Map 2 and large map
28	Westgate	3	Alexandra ward (part); Harbour ward (part); Heysham North ward (part); Overton ward (part – the proposed Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Westgate parish ward); Torrisholme ward (part); Victoria ward (part)	Map 2 and large map

Notes: 1 Lancaster, Morecambe and Skerton are the only unparished parts of the district.
2 Map 2 and Appendix A, including the large map at the back of this report illustrate the proposed wards outlined above.

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Lancaster

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Bolton-le-Sands	2	3,450	1,725	-1	3,500	1,750	-3
2 Bulk	3	5,237	1,746	0	5,542	1,847	3
3 Carnforth	2	3,333	1,667	-4	3,370	1,685	-6
4 Castle	3	5,254	1,751	1	5,700	1,900	6
5 Duke's	1	1,787	1,787	3	1,780	1,780	-1
6 Ellel	2	3,420	1,710	-2	3,580	1,790	-1
7 Halton-with-Aughton	1	1,880	1,880	8	1,910	1,910	6
8 Heysham Sandylands	2	3,352	1,681	-4	3,490	1,745	-3
9 Heysham The Cliffs	2	3,440	1,720	-1	3,650	1,825	1
10 Higher Heysham	3	4,866	1,622	-7	5,192	1,731	-4
11 John O'Gaunt	3	5,407	1,802	3	5,688	1,896	5
12 Kellet	1	1,895	1,895	9	1,950	1,950	8
13 Lune Valley North	1	1,821	1,821	5	1,890	1,890	5
14 Lune Valley South	2	3,560	1,780	2	3,640	1,820	1
15 Overton	1	1,630	1,630	-6	1,648	1,648	-8
16 Parks	2	3,314	1,657	-5	3,400	1,700	-6
17 Poulton	3	5,626	1,875	8	5,650	1,883	5
18 Scotforth East	2	3,700	1,850	6	3,720	1,860	3
19 Scotforth West	3	4,897	1,632	-6	5,500	1,833	2
20 Silverdale	1	1,742	1,742	-0	1,810	1,810	1
21 Skerton East	3	5,011	1,670	-4	5,050	1,683	-7
22 Skerton West	3	4,991	1,664	-5	5,030	1,677	-7
23 Slyne-with-Hest	2	3,493	1,747	0	3,510	1,755	-3

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24 Torrisholme	3	5,375	1,792	3	5,610	1,870	4
25 University	2	3,743	1,872	7	3,760	1,880	4
26 Warton	1	1,885	1,885	8	1,880	1,880	4
27 West End	3	5,396	1,799	3	5,470	1,823	1
28 Westgate	3	5,032	1,677	-4	5,110	1,703	-5
Totals	60	104,537	–	–	108,030	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,742	–	–	1,801	–

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lancaster 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Lancaster City on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the 12 districts in Lancashire (excluding Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool) as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. We expect to review the unitary authorities of Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool in 2001. Our programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to be completed by 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Lancaster. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in September 1975 (Report No. 52). The electoral arrangements of Lancashire County Council were last reviewed in November 1980 (Report No. 399). We expect to review the County Council's electoral arrangements shortly after completion of the district reviews in order to enable orders to be made by the Secretary of State in time for the 2005 county elections.

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

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

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

5 We also have regard to our *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties*. This sets out our approach to the reviews.

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

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

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

9 The review is in four stages (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Stages of the Review

Stage	Description
One	Submission of proposals to the Commission
Two	The Commission’s analysis and deliberation
Three	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
Four	Final deliberation and report to the Secretary of State

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

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1999/2000 PER programme, including the Lancashire districts, that until any direction is received from the Secretary of State, the Commission would continue to maintain its current approach to PERs as set out in the October 1999 *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. The proposals are now being taken forward in a Local Government Bill published in December 1999 and are currently being considered by Parliament.

12 Stage One began on 7 September 1999, when we wrote to Lancaster City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Lancashire County Council, Lancashire Police Authority, Lancashire Association of Parish and Town Councils, parish and town councils in the district, the Members of Parliament and the Members of the European

Parliament for the North-West Region and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 29 November 1999.

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

14 Stage Three began on 4 April 2000 and will end on 5 June 2000. This stage involves publishing the draft recommendations 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 our draft recommendations.***

15 During Stage Four we will reconsider the draft recommendations in the light of the Stage Three consultation, decide whether to move away from them in any areas, and submit final recommendations to the Secretary of State. Interested parties will have a further six weeks to make representations to the Secretary of State. It will then be for him to accept, modify or reject our final recommendations. If the Secretary of State accepts the recommendations, with or without modification, he will make an order. The Secretary of State will determine when any changes come into effect.

2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

16 Lancaster City is situated in the north of Lancashire, and is bounded by South Lakeland in Cumbria to the north, Craven in North Yorkshire to the east and the districts of Ribble Valley and Wyre to the south. It contains 37 parishes, although Lancaster, Morecambe and Skerton are all unparished. Lancaster and Morecambe are the largest towns in the city council area, and comprise around 60 per cent of its total electorate.

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

18 The electorate of the City is 104,537 (February 1999). The City Council presently has 60 members who are elected from 29 wards, 17 of which are relatively urban, the remainder being predominantly rural. Nine of the wards are each represented by three councillors, 13 are each represented by two councillors and seven are single-member wards. The whole City Council is elected together every four years.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been an increase in the electorate in the district, with around 11 per cent more electors than two decades ago as a result of new housing developments. The most significant increases have been in Overton and Scotforth East wards.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,742 electors, which the City Council forecasts will increase to 1,801 by the year 2004 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in 15 of the 29 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the district average, six wards by more than 20 per cent and three wards by more than 30 per cent. The worst imbalance is in Overton ward where the councillor represents 61 per cent more electors than the district average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Lancaster

Figure 4: Existing Electoral Arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Alexandra	3	3,565	1,188	-32	3,600	1,200	-33
2 Arkholme	1	1,362	1,362	-22	1,430	1,430	-21
3 Bolton-le-Sands	2	3,378	1,689	-3	3,430	1,715	-5
4 Bulk	3	5,248	1,749	0	5,550	1,850	3
5 Carnforth	2	4,233	2,117	21	4,270	2,135	19
6 Castle	3	6,268	2,089	20	6,730	2,243	25
7 Caton	2	2,929	1,465	-16	2,970	1,485	-18
8 Ellel	2	3,493	1,747	0	3,660	1,830	2
9 Halton-with-Aughton	1	1,880	1,880	8	1,910	1,910	6
10 Harbour	2	4,101	2,051	18	4,180	2,090	16
11 Heysham Central	2	2,865	1,433	-18	2,900	1,450	-19
12 Heysham North	2	2,967	1,484	-15	3,030	1,515	-16
13 Heysham South	3	5,759	1,920	10	6,260	2,087	16
14 Hornby	1	1,551	1,551	-11	1,590	1,590	-12
15 John O'Gaunt	3	6,066	2,022	16	6,340	2,113	17
16 Kellet	1	1,626	1,626	-7	1,680	1,680	-7
17 Overton	1	2,800	2,800	61	2,810	2,810	56
18 Parks	2	3,496	1,748	0	3,570	1,785	-1
19 Poulton	3	4,240	1,413	-19	4,300	1,433	-20
20 Scotforth East	3	7,178	2,393	37	7,220	2,407	34
21 Scotforth West	3	4,990	1,663	-5	5,590	1,863	3
22 Silverdale	1	1,742	1,742	-0	1,810	1,810	1
23 Skerton Central	2	3,269	1,635	-6	3,300	1,650	-8

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
24 Skerton East	2	2,905	1,453	-17	2,930	1,465	-19
25 Skerton West	2	3,641	1,821	4	3,690	1,845	2
26 Slyne-with-Hest	2	2,665	1,333	-24	2,680	1,340	-26
27 Torrisholme	2	3,633	1,817	4	3,880	1,940	8
28 Victoria	3	4,801	1,600	-8	4,840	1,613	-10
29 Warton	1	1,886	1,886	8	1,880	1,880	4
Totals	60	104,537	–	–	108,030	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,742	–	–	1,801	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lancaster 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 1999, electors in Alexandra ward were relatively over-represented by 32 per cent, while electors in Scotforth East ward were relatively under-represented by 37 per cent. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission visited the area and met with officers and members from the City Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 14 representations during Stage One, including city-wide schemes from the City Council and the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the City Council and the Commission, by appointment.

Lancaster City Council

23 The City Council proposed a council of 63 members, three more than at present, serving 32 wards, compared to the existing 29. It proposed that Lancaster should be represented by 25 members, Morecambe by 22 and the rural area by 16 councillors. These proposals would result in boundary modifications to all wards except Bolton-le-Sands, Silverdale and Warton. It stated that it had sought to represent the identities and interests of the different communities that comprise the district. In addition, it put forward an alternative option for Overton ward that sought to provide a better level of electoral equality than its preferred proposal.

24 Under the City Council's preferred option, the number of electors per councillor in six of the proposed 32 wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average, however this level of electoral imbalance is projected to improve over the next five years, with only Overton ward having an electoral imbalance of more than 10 per cent from the average by 2004. However, only five wards would have an electoral imbalance of more than 10 per cent under its alternative option, with no wards projected to have an electoral imbalance of more than 10 per cent by 2004. The Council's proposals are summarised at Appendix B.

Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties

25 The Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed retaining a council of 60 members. They argued that Lancaster merited 23 councillors, two more than at present, Morecambe should be represented by 21 councillors, one fewer than at present, and the rural area by 16 members, one less than at present. Their proposal would result in boundary modifications to all wards except Halton-with-Aughton, Silverdale and Warton.

26 Under the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals, the number of electors per councillor in all wards except Overton ward would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the district average, while Overton ward would have an electoral imbalance of 25 per cent from the average. This improved level of electoral equality is projected to be largely unchanged over the next five years.

Lancaster City Council Liberal Democrat Group

27 Lancaster City Council Liberal Democrat Group broadly supported the City Council's proposals, but proposed that the part of Scotforth parish to the west of Lancaster University should continue to be represented in Caton ward.

Parish and Town Councils

28 We received representations direct from five parish and town councils. Arkholme-with-Cawood Parish Council expressed concern that alternative warding arrangements would result in a reduced level of representation for the rural areas, and argued that adjoining parishes should not be combined with the existing Arkholme ward. Carnforth Town Council argued that Carnforth's existing ward boundaries should be retained, but that it should be represented by three councillors, one more than at present. As an alternative it suggested that the Millhead area could be combined with Carnforth ward, to improve the level of electoral equality.

29 Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Parish Council objected to the City Council's proposal to include part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe in a ward with part of Morecambe. It proposed that a new Heaton-with-Oxcliffe ward should be coterminous with the boundary of the parish. Over Kellet Parish Council objected to the City Council's proposal to include Over Kellet parish in a revised Carnforth ward, arguing that it should continue to be represented in a rural ward. Overton Parish Council suggested that the parishes of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe, Middleton and Overton should continue to form a city ward, to be represented by two councillors, rather than one as at present.

Other Representations

30 We received a further six representations from local residents and groups. The North-West Conservatives supported the Lancaster and Morecambe Conservative Associations' views, although we did not receive a separate submission from either Conservative Association. Morecambe Neighbourhood Council objected to the City Council's proposal to increase the council size by three. It argued that there should be a greater number of single- and two-member wards, and put forward alternative electoral arrangements for Morecambe.

31 The Federation of Skerton Labour Parties proposed that Skerton should be represented by two three-member wards. A local resident objected to the City Council's proposals for the rural areas and proposed that the City Council should comprise 65 councillors, with the majority of the existing electoral arrangements being retained. Two residents supported the City Council's proposals for their local areas.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

35 Our *Guidance* states that we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, but we consider that, if electoral imbalances are to be kept to the minimum, the objective 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 start from the standpoint of electoral equality, and then make adjustments to reflect relevant factors, such as community identity. Regard must also be had to five-year forecasts of changes in electorates. We will require particular justification for schemes which result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10 per cent in any ward. Any imbalances of 20 per cent and over should arise only in the most exceptional of circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

Electorate Forecasts

36 The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of some 3 per cent from 104,537 to 108,030 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects the growth to occur evenly throughout the district, although Heysham South and Scotforth West wards are projected to have an additional 500 and 600 electors respectively by 2004. The City Council has 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.

37 At Stage One Carnforth Town Council argued that the City Council’s electoral projections for Carnforth ward did not take account of the likely residential development. It contended that “if all the developments proceed to completion” there would be an additional 700 electors in Carnforth ward. In the light of this alternative projection, we sought further clarification from the

City Council regarding its electoral forecast for Carnforth ward. We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science, but having considered carefully electoral forecasts in the light of evidence received at Stage One, and following further advice from the City Council, we are content that the City Council's electoral forecasts represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time. On balance, we do not consider that a high level of residential development is likely to occur in Carnforth ward within the next five years. Nevertheless, we would welcome further evidence on electorate forecasts during Stage Three.

Council Size

38 As already explained, the Commission's starting point is to assume that the current council size facilitates convenient and effective local government.

39 The City of Lancaster currently has 60 councillors. During Stage One there was broad consensus that there was little justification for any substantial increase or decrease in the current number of councillors. The City Council proposed a council of 63 members, arguing that it wished to "remain at broadly the same size", and that a council of 63 members would better reflect the "particular circumstances and characteristics of the district". Lancaster City Council Liberal Democrat Group supported the City Council's proposal to increase the size of the council by three councillors.

40 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties argued that 60 councillors is "sufficient to represent the electors of Lancaster district". Morecambe Neighbourhood Council put forward alternative warding arrangements for Morecambe, based on a council size of 60 members, while a local resident proposed that the City Council should be represented by 65 councillors.

41 We do not generally seek a substantial increase or decrease in council size but are prepared to consider the case for change where there is persuasive evidence. In our *Guidance* we note that we have found it necessary to guard against an upward drift in the number of councillors, and that any proposal for an increase in council size would need to be fully justified. We do not consider that there is sufficient evidence that additional councillors are necessary in order to facilitate convenient and effective local government in Lancaster, or to reflect the identities and interests of local communities.

42 Having considered carefully the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have concluded that the statutory criteria and the achievement of electoral equality would best be met by a council of 60 members. However, we would welcome further views on council size during Stage Three of this review.

Electoral Arrangements

43 After careful consideration of the evidence received at Stage One, we find that there is merit in the schemes submitted by the City Council, and Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties. Both of these submissions would provide improved levels of electoral equality. Furthermore, we note that both of these proposals would allocate the correct level of representation to Lancaster, Morecambe and the rural area, although Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal would provide an equitable distribution of councillors while retaining the existing council size.

44 Both the City Council and Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed that we recommend modifications to external parish boundaries. However, the Commission is unable to recommend modifications to parish boundaries as part of this current review, and we have not therefore adopted either of the schemes where they include such modifications.

45 We have also examined the proposals put forward by Morecambe Neighbourhood Council and a local resident, but we have not been persuaded that they would secure better electoral arrangements. We note Morecambe Neighbourhood Council's preference that wards should be represented by one or two councillors. However, the boundaries that it suggested may facilitate this preference would result in the number of electors per councillors in 10 wards varying by more than 10 per cent, with seven of these wards having an electoral imbalance of more than 20 per cent. While Morecambe Neighbourhood Council utilised a number of strong and easily identifiable boundaries in Morecambe, we are not persuaded that its proposal would secure a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In addition, we do not consider that three-member wards necessarily inhibit the representation of electors' identities and interests, and we have not given weight to this argument.

46 We also consider that a local resident's proposal for a 65-member council would not provide a optimum balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria as it would result in a high degree of electoral inequality. Furthermore, as indicated previously, we have not been persuaded that the size of Lancaster City Council should be increased. In addition, the resident did not define boundaries between his proposed wards, and we have therefore discounted his proposals from our considerations.

47 In our judgement, Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One and we have therefore based our draft recommendations on their submission. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals in three areas. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Arkholme and Hornby wards;
- (b) Caton and Ellel wards;
- (c) Halton-with-Aughton, Kellet, Silverdale and Warton wards;
- (d) Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth and Slyne-with-Hest wards;

- (e) Overton ward;
- (f) Lancaster (eight wards);
- (g) Morecambe (nine wards).

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

Arkholme and Hornby wards

49 Arkholme and Hornby wards are each represented by one councillor and are located in the north-east of the district, adjoining Lancashire's county boundary. Under current arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Arkholme and Hornby wards would be 22 per cent and 11 cent less than the district average respectively (21 per cent and 12 per cent by 2004).

50 At Stage One the City Council proposed that the parishes of Borwick and Priest Hutton which are currently in Kellet ward should be included in Arkholme ward, together with Aughton village which is currently in Halton-with-Aughton ward. It argued that "the community of Aughton has as much identity to the Arkholme ward as it does to Halton". It also proposed that Melling-with-Wrayton parish should be combined with Hornby ward, while the rest of Hornby ward's existing boundaries should be retained. Both wards would each be represented by one councillor. Under the City Council's proposal for a council of 63 members, Arkholme and Hornby wards would initially have 7 per cent fewer and 7 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average respectively (6 per cent fewer and 6 per cent more by 2004).

51 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed that the area be represented by two new wards, with Lune Valley North ward comprising the parishes of Burrow-with-Burrow, Leck, Whittington, Tunstall, Cantsfield, Melling-with-Wrayton, Gressingham, Hornby-with-Farleton and Claughton, while Lune Valley South ward would comprise the parishes of Tatham, Wray-with-Botton, Roeburndale, Caton-with-Littledale and Quernmore. The proposed Lune Valley North ward would be represented by one councillor, while the new Lune Valley South ward would be represented by two councillors. In addition, they proposed combining Arkholme-with-Cawood parish in a ward with parishes to its east.

52 Under Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal for a 60-member council, Lune Valley North and Lune Valley South wards would have 5 per cent and 2 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain constant over the next five years.

53 In addition, we received a submission from Arkholme-with-Cawood Parish Council, which argued that parishes in adjoining wards should not be transferred to Arkholme ward.

54 As we have already stated, we are proposing to base our draft recommendations on Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' submission. We consider that their proposed Lune Valley North and Lune Valley South wards would achieve a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria, and are content to endorse them as our draft recommendations. In particular, we consider that both wards comprise rural parishes which appear to share similar community

interests and identities. In contrast, we note that the City Council's proposals, arising from its suggested 63-member council, would involve combining areas which appear to have less in common.

Caton and Ellel wards

55 Caton and Ellel are each represented by two councillors and are located in the south of the district. The parish of Scotforth is divided by land occupied by Lancaster University and is part of two wards; Caton and Ellel. Caton ward contains the parishes of Caton-with-Littlemore, Scotforth and Quernmore, while Ellel ward comprises the parishes of Cockerham, Ellel, Over Wyresdale and Thurnham, together with a detached part of Scotforth parish to the west of Lancaster University. Under current arrangements Caton ward has 16 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, while the number of electors per councillor in Ellel ward is equal to the average (18 per cent fewer and 2 per cent more by 2004).

56 At Stage One the City Council proposed transferring Over Wyresdale from Ellel ward to a revised Caton ward, with the rest of Caton's existing ward boundaries being retained. It also proposed including the part of Scotforth parish to the west of Lancaster University in a revised Ellel ward. Under its proposals Ellel parish would be further warded, with University halls of residence in the north of the parish being transferred to a new University ward, which would also include halls of residence in the south of the existing Scotforth East ward. It also proposed that Thurnham parish boundary should be "rationalised" to include electors to the east of the Glasson branch of the Lancaster canal in Scotforth ward. It proposed that the rest of Ellel ward's boundaries should be retained. It suggested that each ward should continue to be represented by two councillors.

57 Under the City Council's proposal, Caton and Ellel wards would have 5 per cent and 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. This improved level of electoral equality is projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years.

58 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposed University ward was identical to the City Council's proposal. However they suggested that Caton ward, less Scotforth parish, should be included in Lune Valley South ward, as detailed previously. They also proposed that Ellel parish, less the area containing Lancaster University halls of residence, should be combined with the parishes of Cockerham, Over Wyresdale and Thurnham, together with the part of Scotforth parish to the west of Lancaster University campus, in a revised Ellel ward. Under these proposals, Ellel ward would have 2 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years.

59 Lancaster City Council Liberal Democrat Group argued that the part of Scotforth parish to the east of Lancaster University should be included in Caton ward, while a local resident supported the City Council's proposed Ellel ward.

60 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we note that both district-wide submissions put forward identical electoral arrangements for a new University ward, and we concur that this ward would achieve a good balance between electoral equality and the

statutory criteria, and therefore propose to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations. We also note that both district-wide proposals would include the part of Scotforth parish to the west of Lancaster University in a ward with Ellel parish, and we are content to endorse this consensus. However, as a consequence of our draft recommendations in the north-east of the district detailed previously, we propose endorsing Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposed Ellel ward, as we consider that it would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality while appearing to satisfactorily reflect the interests and identities of communities. We have considered Lancaster City Council Liberal Democrat Group's proposal to represent the part of Scotforth parish to the east of the University campus in a ward with the parishes of Caton-with-Littledale and Quernmore. However, we do not consider that this proposal would achieve better electoral arrangements than our draft recommendations. Our proposed ward boundaries in this area are detailed on the large map at the back of this report.

61 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in Ellel ward would be 2 per cent fewer than the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years.

Halton-with-Aughton, Kellet, Silverdale and Warton wards

62 These four wards are located in the north-west of the district. Under current arrangements the number of electors per councillor in Halton-with-Aughton and Warton wards each varies by 8 per cent more than the district average, Kellet ward has 7 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average, while the number of electors per councillor in Silverdale ward is equal to the average. These councillor:elector ratios are projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years.

63 At Stage One the City Council proposed transferring Aughton village from Halton-with-Aughton ward to a revised Arkholme ward, as detailed previously, with the village of Halton forming a new Halton ward. It proposed that Kellet ward should be divided between adjoining wards, with the parishes of Borwick and Priest Hutton forming part of a revised Arkholme ward, Over Kellet being included in a revised Carnforth ward, and Nether Kellet parish being included in a new Slyne & Kellet ward. The City Council proposed that the electoral arrangements of the wards of Silverdale and Warton should be retained. It proposed that Slyne & Kellet ward should be represented by two councillors, while Halton, Silverdale and Warton wards would continue to be represented by one councillor.

64 Under the City Council's proposal for a council of 63 members, Halton, Silverdale, Slyne & Kellet and Warton would have 9 per cent, 5 per cent, 4 per cent and 14 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average. These levels of electoral variance are projected to be largely unchanged over the next five years.

65 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed retaining Halton-with-Aughton, Silverdale and Warton's existing electoral arrangements, while they proposed that Arkholme-with-Cawood parish should be included in a revised Kellet ward. Under these proposals, all four wards would have an electoral imbalance of less than 9 per cent. This level of electoral equality is projected to be largely unchanged over the next five years.

66 Over Kellet Parish Council objected to the City Council's proposal to include Over Kellet parish in a revised Carnforth ward, arguing that it should continue to be represented in a ward with the parishes of Borwick, Nether Kellet and Priest Hutton. A local resident also argued that Over Kellet should continue to be represented in a ward with Nether Kellet parish.

67 As outlined earlier in this report, we are proposing to base our draft recommendations for the district on Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' scheme. We note that their proposals would broadly retain the existing arrangements in this area, and we are content that they achieve a good balance between electoral equality and the representation of the interests and identities of communities. In addition, we consider that the City Council's proposals do not appear to reflect the interests and identities of Over Kellet, which we consider should be represented in a ward with similar rural parishes. We are therefore adopting Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposed Halton-with-Aughton, Kellet, Silverdale and Warton wards as part of our draft recommendations.

Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth and Slyne-with-Hest wards

68 Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth and Slyne-with-Hest wards are situated to the north-east of Morecambe, and currently have relatively high levels of electoral variance namely 3 per cent fewer, 21 per cent more and 24 per cent fewer than the city average respectively (5 per cent below, 19 per cent below and 26 per cent below by 2004).

69 At Stage One the City Council proposed that Bolton-le-Sands ward's existing electoral arrangements should be retained, while it proposed that Over Kellet parish should be included in Carnforth ward to provide a reasonable level of electoral equality. It suggested that Nether Kellet parish should be combined with Slyne-with-Hest parish to form a new Slyne & Kellet ward. Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne & Kellet wards would each be represented by two councillors, while Carnforth ward would be represented by three councillors. Under these proposals for a 63-member council, the number of electors per councillor in Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne & Kellet wards would vary by 2 per cent and 4 per cent from the district average respectively.

70 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed modification to all three wards, with the part of Bolton-le-Sands parish to the south of the junction between the A5105 coastal road and the A6 by-pass being transferred to a revised Slyne-with-Hest ward, to improve electoral equality. In addition, they suggested that the part of Carnforth ward to the east of Crag Bank Lane and to the south of the railway line should be included in Bolton-le-Sands ward, arguing that this would provide a better level of electoral equality than the existing arrangements.

71 Carnforth Town Council and Over Kellet Parish Council objected to the City Council's proposal to combine Carnforth town and Over Kellet parish. In addition, Carnforth Town Council suggested that Carnforth's ward boundaries should be retained, but that it should be represented by three councillors, one more than at present. It argued that "there is strong reason to anticipate very substantial growth ... in the following years". Under Carnforth Town Council's proposal, the number of electors per councillor in Carnforth ward would be 18 per cent less than the district average. This level of electoral imbalance is projected to marginally deteriorate over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor in Carnforth ward projected to be 20 per cent less than the average by 2004.

72 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we note that the City Council's proposals have not secured a high degree of local support in this area, while we consider that Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals utilise strong and easily identifiable boundaries and provide a reasonable level of electoral equality. We note that these proposals would result in warding both Bolton-le-Sands parish and Carnforth town, but consider that the proposed warding arrangements in this area appear to satisfactorily reflect the interests and identities of communities. We are therefore content to adopt Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals without modification. However, we would welcome further evidence from local people and groups at Stage Three.

73 We have considered Carnforth Town Council's proposal that Carnforth town should continue to form a separate district ward, to be represented by three councillors. However, as indicated earlier, we have not been persuaded that the growth on which its electorate projections rely is likely to occur. This proposal would result in a high degree of electoral inequality both initially and over the next five years and, on balance, we are not persuaded that this is merited in Carnforth. Details of the proposed ward boundaries are shown on the large map at the back of this report, and in Appendix A.

Overton ward

74 Overton ward is located to the south of Morecambe, and is bounded by Morecambe Bay to the west, the river Lune to the east and Wyre borough to the south. Under current arrangements, Overton ward has 61 per cent more electors per councillor than the district average. By 2004, this high level of electoral inequality is projected to improve marginally, with Overton ward expected to have 56 per cent more electors per councillor than the average.

75 At Stage One the City Council proposed that Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish should be divided between adjoining wards. It proposed that the part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish including the Grosvenor Park estate and the White Lund Trading Estate, together with the area to the east of Westcliffe Drive and the north of Oxcliffe Road, should be included in a new Westgate ward. It also proposed the Winstler Park estate should be united in Skerton West ward, while the rural part of the parish would continue to be combined with the parishes of Middleton and Overton to form a revised Overton ward. Overton and Westgate wards would be represented by one councillor and three councillors respectively.

76 The City Council also suggested an alternative option for Overton ward, which only differed from its preferred option in relation to the boundary between Overton and Heysham South wards. It proposed that the area to the south of the A683 Trumacar Lane/Rothesay Road should be included in a revised Overton ward.

77 Under the City Council's preferred option, Overton ward would have 19 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average, while under its alternative option Overton ward would have 4 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average. Both levels of electoral variance are projected to remain constant over the next five years.

78 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal for Overton ward is substantially the same as the City Council's, but includes the Grosvenor Park estate in Torrisholme ward. Under a 60-member council, Overton ward would have 25 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average.

79 We also received representations from two parish councils relating to this area. Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Parish Council objected to the proposals to include the urban part of the parish in Morecambe wards, stating that it would not satisfactorily reflect Heaton-with-Oxcliffe's interests and identities, and that it could lead to the parish's external boundary being modified in any subsequent review of parish boundaries undertaken by the City Council. It proposed that Heaton-with-Oxcliffe should form a separate district ward, and suggested that Overton and Middleton parishes could be combined to form a revised Overton ward. Each ward would be represented by one councillor. It also proposed that the part of Grosvenor Park estate in Torrisholme ward should be included in the proposed Heaton-with-Oxcliffe ward, while the Winster Park estate would be wholly represented in Skerton West ward. Under this proposal, the number of electors per councillor in Heaton-with-Oxcliffe and Overton wards would vary by 14 per cent and 6 per cent fewer than the district average, under a council of 60 members.

80 Overton Parish Council proposed that Overton's existing warding arrangements should be retained, but that the ward should be represented by two councillors, one more than at present. Under these proposals, Overton ward would have 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average.

81 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we note that the City Council and Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties put forward broadly similar proposals for Overton ward, and we are content to substantially adopt their proposals as our draft recommendations. However, we consider Lancaster & Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal to unite the Grosvenor Park estate in Torrisholme ward has merit, as the Grosvenor Park estate shares good communication links with communities in Torrisholme ward. In addition, under the City Council's proposal, the estate would be divided from the rest of the proposed Westgate ward by the White Lund Trading Estate.

82 We note that the City Council's preferred option for Overton ward and Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal would result in a high degree of electoral imbalance both initially and over the next five years. We have therefore examined alternative arrangements, including the City Council's alternative proposal to include part of Heysham South ward in the revised Overton ward. We consider that this proposal achieves a better level of electoral equality than the other proposals put forward at Stage One or the existing arrangements, and propose adopting it as our draft recommendation for the purpose of consultation.

83 We have considered the proposals put forward by Heaton-with-Oxcliffe and Overton parish councils, but note that they would both result in high degrees of electoral inequality, both in the proposed rural wards and wards in Morecambe. In our judgement, and following a visit to the area, we are of the opinion that the northern part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish shares similar interests and identities with electors in Morecambe, and we are content that those community ties would be better reflected by our draft recommendations than by these alternative proposals.

However, we propose, in addition to transferring the area to the south of the A683 Trumacar Lane/Rothesay Road, transferring a further 68 electors from the Bell Aire Caravan Park, from the proposed Higher Heysham ward to further enhance electoral equality. We would welcome further evidence regarding our proposed Overton ward from local people and groups at Stage Three.

84 Under our draft recommendations, Overton ward would have 6 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years. Our proposed ward boundaries in this area are detailed on the large map at the back of this report.

Lancaster (eight wards)

85 Lancaster is the historic county town of Lancashire, and is a focus for shopping and tourism in the north of the county. It comprises the wards of Bulk, Castle, John O’Gaunt, Scotforth East and Scotforth West to the south of the River Lune, and Skerton Central, Skerton East and Skerton West wards to the north. Under existing arrangements, the number of electors per councillor in Castle, John O’Gaunt and Scotforth East varies by 20 per cent, 16 per cent and 37 per cent more than the district average respectively, while Scotforth West, Skerton Central and Skerton East have 5 per cent, 6 per cent and 17 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average respectively. The number of electors per councillor in Bulk ward is equal to the average.

86 At Stage One the City Council argued that this area merited 25 councillors under a council size of 63. It proposed that the Winster Park estate should be wholly represented in Skerton West ward, as detailed previously, while the area bounded by Torrisholme Road, the West Coast main line, Scale Hall Lane and the A589 Morecambe Road should be transferred from Skerton West to Skerton Central ward. It also proposed that the area north-east of Barley Cop Lane should be included in Skerton East ward.

87 It put forward several significant modifications to the ward boundaries in Lancaster to the south of the River Lune. The City Council suggested that the Lancaster University campus should be separately represented in a two-member University ward, which would comprise part of Ellel parish with the southern part of Scotforth parish, as described previously. It proposed that John O’Gaunt and Scotforth East wards should be divided between three two-member wards, to be named Bowerham, Hala and Scotforth ward while a new Primrose ward would comprise parts of Bulk and John O’Gaunt wards and be represented by two councillors. It suggested that parts of Castle and Scotforth West wards should be combined to form a new John O’Gaunt ward, with the rest of Castle ward forming a new Marsh ward, while the rest of Bulk ward would continue to form a city ward, but be represented by two councillors, one fewer than at present.

88 Under the City Council’s proposals for a council of 63 members, the number of electors per councillor in four of the 12 proposed wards would vary by more than 10 per cent from the district average. However, this level of electoral equality is projected to improve marginally, with all 12 wards having an electoral imbalance of no more than 10 per cent by 2004.

89 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties argued that Lancaster merits 23 councillors under a council of 60 members, two more than at present. They stated that the present boundaries are

“well established” and that they had sought to reflect this in their proposals. In the north of Lancaster, they proposed that Skerton should be represented by two three-member wards, with the current Skerton Central ward being divided between revised Skerton East and Skerton West wards. They proposed that Bulk, Castle, John O’Gaunt and Scotforth West’s electoral arrangements should be substantially retained, however they suggested that parts of all four should be combined to form a new single-member Duke’s ward, so that the central area of the city could be separately represented. In addition, they suggested that the area to the east of Lancaster Cathedral should be transferred from John O’Gaunt ward to Bulk ward.

90 In the south of Lancaster, their proposed University ward was identical to the City Council’s proposal as described earlier, while they proposed that the part of Scotforth East ward to the north of Lancaster University campus should form a revised two-member ward.

91 Under these proposals for a council of 60 members, the number of electors per councillor in all of the nine proposed wards would vary by less than 7 per cent from the district average. This improved level of electoral equality is projected to continue over the next five years.

92 We received three further submissions from local residents and groups relating to electoral arrangements in the city. The Federation of Skerton Labour Parties proposed that Skerton should be represented by two three-member wards, utilising boundaries proposed by the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties. A local resident supported the City Council’s proposal to combine part of Scotforth West ward with part of Ellel ward, while another resident supported its proposed Castle ward.

93 Having considered carefully the representations received at Stage One, we note that Lancaster merits 23 councillors under a 60-member council. On balance, we consider that Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties’ proposal would provide the correct level of representation for the city, while securing a good balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. In particular, we consider that their proposals would substantially retain the existing arrangements, which we are content achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality while satisfactorily reflecting the interests and identities of communities. Accordingly, we are endorsing Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties’ proposal as our draft recommendations.

94 However, we are concerned that our proposal for Skerton East and Skerton West wards would utilise boundaries that may not be strong and easily identifiable. We would therefore welcome alternative proposals from local people that would secure equality of representation while also reflecting the interests and identities of communities.

95 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in all nine proposed wards would vary by less than 7 per cent from the district average. This improved level of electoral equality is projected to continue over the next five years. Our proposed ward boundaries in Lancaster are detailed on the large map at the back of this report.

Morecambe (nine wards)

96 Morecambe was developed as a Victorian tourist resort, and borders Morecambe Bay and Half Moon Bay. The town is currently represented by 22 councillors serving nine wards (Alexandra, Harbour, Heysham Central, Heysham North, Heysham South, Parks, Poulton, Torrisholme and Victoria). Under existing arrangements, five of the nine wards have an electoral imbalance of more than 10 per cent from the district average, while Alexandra ward has 32 per cent fewer electors per councillor than the average. This level of electoral inequality is not expected to change significantly over the next five years.

97 At Stage One the City Council proposed that Morecambe should be represented by 22 councillors, under a council of 63 members. It acknowledged that the existing level of representation for the town is “on the high side”, and that its proposal would increase this over-representation. It proposed that a new Westgate ward should comprise parts of Harbour and Torrisholme wards, together with part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish as detailed previously, and be represented by three councillors. It proposed that Torrisholme ward’s existing arrangements should be substantially retained, and that the ward should continue to be represented by two councillors.

98 The City Council suggested that a new Broadway South ward should comprise part of Victoria ward, together with the part of Parks ward to the south of the railway line, while it proposed that the rest of Parks ward should be combined with part of Poulton ward to form a new two-member Bare ward. It proposed that the rest of Poulton ward should continue to be represented in a two-member ward of the same name, while a new Regent ward would comprise parts of Alexandra and Harbour wards. It put forward relatively minor modifications for wards covering Heysham, with the part of Alexandra ward to the south of Devonshire Road being included in a revised Heysham North ward, while it proposed that the Kingsway and Blackberry Hall estates should be transferred from Heysham South ward to Heysham Central ward.

99 Under the City Council’s proposals for a 63-member council, the number of electors per councillor in all nine of the proposed wards would vary by less than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality is expected to remain largely unchanged over the next five years.

100 Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties argued that Morecambe merited 21 councillors under a council size of 60. They broadly supported the City Council’s proposals for Heysham Central, Heysham North, Heysham South and Regent wards, but proposed that they should be named Heysham The Cliffs, Heysham Sandylands Higher Heysham and West End wards respectively. They noted that their proposals for this area would achieve a better level of electoral equality, under a council size of 60 members.

101 They put forward alternative arrangements for the rest of the town. They proposed that a new Westgate ward should comprise parts of Heysham North, Harbour, Torrisholme and Victoria wards, together with part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish, as detailed previously. They proposed that a revised Torrisholme ward would include the majority of the existing Torrisholme ward together with the part of Parks ward to the south of the railway line and the Grosvenor estate, in

Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish, while they proposed that a revised Parks ward should include parts of the existing Parks and Poulton wards. In addition, they suggested that a revised Poulton ward should include the remainder of Poulton and Victoria wards.

102 Under Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposal for a council size of 60, the number of electors per councillor in all eight of the proposed wards would vary by less than 10 per cent from the district average. This level of electoral equality is projected to marginally improve over the next five years, with the number of electors per councillor in all of the wards projected to vary by no more than 6 per cent from the average by 2004.

103 Morecambe Neighbourhood Council argued that Morecambe should be covered by a "greater number of wards represented by one or two members" and that wards in Morecambe should provide good electoral equality to allow equality of representation between Morecambe and Lancaster. It suggested possible ward boundaries that would facilitate its views although, as indicated previously, these proposed wards would result in high levels of electoral inequality. However, we note that its proposals for a number of wards are similar to the City Council's scheme for the town.

104 We have considered the proposals put forward at Stage Three, and note that Morecambe is entitled to 20.8 councillors under a council size of 60. As the City Council proposes that Morecambe should be represented by 22 councillors to facilitate its proposed council size of 63 members, we are unable to take account of its proposals for the town. However, we note that both district-wide schemes agree in relation to the boundaries of four wards. We agree that these proposals would provide a reasonable level of electoral equality, while satisfactorily reflecting the interests and identities of communities, and propose adopting them as our draft recommendations. However, as indicated previously, we propose including the area to the south of Rothesay Road and Trumacar Lane in a revised Overton ward to provide an improved level of electoral equality in the proposed Overton ward. In addition, we propose adopting the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposed ward names.

105 In the rest of the town, we propose endorsing Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals, without modification. We consider that these proposals would achieve a reasonable level of electoral equality, while appearing to reflect the interests and identities of communities. In addition, we consider that their proposals would utilise strong and easily identifiable boundaries, such as railway line and the A589 Broadway.

106 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in all eight wards would vary by less than 10 per cent both initially and by 2004. Our proposed ward boundaries in this area are detailed on the large map at the back of this report.

Electoral Cycle

107 At Stage One we received no proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the city. Accordingly, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of whole-council elections every four years.

Conclusions

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

- (a) a council of 60 members should be retained;
- (b) there should be 28 wards, one less than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of 26 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward;
- (d) elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

109 As already indicated, we have based our draft recommendations on the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties' proposals, but propose departing from them in the following areas:

- (a) between the proposed Heysham The Cliffs and Overton wards, we propose transferring an additional 68 electors from the Bell Aire caravan park and 250 electors south of the area to the south of the A683 Trumacar Lane/Rothesay Road;
- (b) we propose transferring an additional 232 electors from Melrose Street, Balmoral Road and St Peter's Road from the modified John O'Gaunt ward to the modified Bulk ward;
- (c) we propose retaining 20 electors from The Grove in the modified John O'Gaunt ward rather than them being transferred to the proposed Duke's ward.

110 Figure 5 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 1999 electorate figures and with forecast electorates for the year 2004.

Figure 5: Comparison of Current and Recommended Electoral Arrangements

	1999 electorate		2004 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	60	60	60	60
Number of wards	29	28	29	28
Average number of electors per councillor	1,742	1,801	1,742	1,801
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	15	0	16	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	6	0	6	0

111 As shown in Figure 5, our draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards varying by more than 10 per cent from the city average from 15 to none.

Draft Recommendation
 Lancaster City Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 28 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A, including the large map inside the back cover. Elections should continue to be held for the whole council.

Parish Council Electoral Arrangements

112 In undertaking reviews of electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as is reasonably practicable with the provisions set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth (town council), Ellel, Heaton-with-Oxcliffe, and Scotforth to reflect the proposed city wards.

113 The parish of Bolton-le-Sands is currently served by 10 parish councillors, and is not warded. Under the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties’ proposal the parish of Bolton-le-Sands would be warded. We propose that Bolton-le-Sands should comprise two parish wards, Bolton-le-Sands North and Bolton-le-Sands South, which would reflect the proposed city wards. We do not propose any change to the current parish council size, with Bolton-le-Sands South parish ward returning three parish councillors, and Bolton-le-Sands North returning seven parish councillors.

Draft Recommendation

Bolton-le-Sand Parish Council should comprise 10 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Bolton-le-Sands South (returning three councillors) and Bolton-le-Sands North (returning seven councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

114 Carnforth Town Council is currently served by 12 town councillors and is not warded. In order to improve electoral imbalances within the area, we propose warding Carnforth town. The consequential effect of this proposal would be the creation of two town-council wards: Carnforth Crag Bank and Carnforth Town.

Draft Recommendation

Carnforth Town Council should comprise 12 councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Carnforth Town (returning eight councillors) and Carnforth Crag Bank (returning four councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map A2 in Appendix A.

115 The parish of Ellel is currently served by nine councillors and has two parish wards: North (returning five councillors) and South (returning four councillors). During Stage One, both the City Council and the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed that part of the parish which includes a Hall of Residence of Lancaster University should form part of a new two-member University ward. We endorse this proposal as part of our draft recommendations. In order to facilitate this proposal, we propose that a new University parish ward of Ellel parish should be established.

Draft Recommendation

Ellel Parish Council should comprise nine councillors, as at present, representing three wards: South ward should continue to return four parish councillors, North ward should return four parish councillors and University ward should return one parish councillor. The boundaries between the three parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

116 The parish of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe is currently represented by seven parish councillors and is not warded. Both the City Council and the Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed that the urban area of the parish should be transferred to the urban wards within the Morecambe /Skerton area. In order to facilitate this proposal we propose creating four new parish wards: Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Rural parish ward (returning one parish councillor), Heaton-with-Oxcliffe

Westgate parish ward (returning two parish councillors), Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Torrisholme parish ward (returning two parish councillors) and Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Winster Park parish ward (returning two parish councillors).

Draft Recommendation
Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Parish Council should comprise seven parish councillors, the same as at present, representing four wards: Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Rural (returning one councillor), Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Westgate (returning two councillors), Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Torrisholme (returning two councillors) and Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Winster Park (returning two councillors). The boundaries between the parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

117 The parish of Scotforth is currently represented by five parish councillors and is unwarded. However, the parish is currently a detached parish council, with the parish divided by land occupied by the University of Lancaster. The Lancaster and Morecambe Labour Parties proposed including both parts of the detached parish ward from the existing Caton ward in the modified Ellel ward. We endorse this proposal as part of our draft recommendations and are of the view that this would be best achieved through the warding of the parish.

Draft Recommendation
Scotforth Parish Council should comprise five parish councillors, as at present, and the parish should be divided into two parish wards: Scotforth Burrow Heights (returning one councillor) and Scotforth Parish (returning four councillors). The boundaries between the parish wards should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries, as illustrated and named on the large map inserted at the back of this report.

118 We are not proposing any change to the electoral cycle of parish and town councils in the district.

Draft Recommendation
For parish and town councils, whole-council elections should continue to take place every four years, on the same cycle as that of the City Council.

119 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Lancaster and welcome comments from the City Council and others relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors, electoral cycle, 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.

Map 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Lancaster

5 NEXT STEPS

120 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Lancaster. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 5 June 2000. Representations received after this date may not be taken into account. All representations will be available for public inspection by appointment at the offices of the Commission and the City Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

121 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Lancaster Review
Local Government Commission for England
Dolphyn Court
10/11 Great Turnstile
London WC1V 7JU

Fax: 020 7404 6142

E-mail: reviews@lgce.gov.uk

122 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 Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions. After the publication of our final recommendations, all further correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of State, who cannot make an order giving effect to our recommendations until six weeks after he receives them.

APPENDIX A

Draft Recommendations for Lancaster: Detailed Mapping

The following maps illustrate the Commission's proposed ward boundaries for the City of Lancaster.

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

Map A2 illustrates the proposed warding of Carnforth town.

The **large map** inserted at the back of this report illustrates the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Lancaster and Morecambe.

Map A1: Draft Recommendations for Lancaster: Key Map

Map A2: Proposed Warding of Carnforth Town

APPENDIX B

Lancaster City Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the City Council in 26 wards, where the Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure B1: Lancaster City Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

Ward name	Constituent areas
Arkholme	Arkholme ward – part (the parishes of Arkholme-with-Cawood, Burrow-with-Burrow, Cantsfield, Gressingham, Ireby, Leck and Whittington); Hornby ward (part – the parishes of Bowick and Priest Hutton); Halton-with-Aughton ward (part – the proposed Aughton parish ward of Halton-with-Aughton parish)
Bare	Parks ward (part); Poulton ward (part)
Bolton-le-Sands	<i>Unchanged</i> (Bolton-le-Sands parish)
Bowerham	John O'Gaunt ward (part); Scotforth East ward (part)
Broadway	Parks ward (part); Victoria ward (part)
Bulk	Bulk ward (part); Castle ward (part); John O'Gaunt ward (part)
Carnforth	Carnforth ward; Kellet ward (part – Over Kellet parish)
Caton	Caton ward (part – the parishes of Caton-with-Littledale, Over Wyresdale, Scotforth and Quernmore)
Ellel	Ellel ward (the parishes of Cockerham, Ellel (part – the parish wards of Ellel North and Ellel South) and Thurnham); Scotforth West ward (part); Caton ward (part – Scotforth parish (detached))
Freehold	Bulk ward (part)
Hala	John O' Gaunt ward (part); Scotforth East ward (part)
Halton	Halton-with-Aughton ward (part – the proposed Halton parish ward of Halton-with-Aughton parish)
Heysham South	Heysham South ward (part)
Hornby	Arkholme ward – (part – the parish of Melling-with-Wrayton); Hornby ward (part – the parishes of Cloughton, Hornby-with-Farlon, Roeburndale, Tatham, Wennington and Wray-with-Botton)
John O'Gaunt	Castle ward (part); Scotforth West ward (part)
Marsh	Castle ward (part)
Overton	Heysham South ward (part); Overton ward (part – Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish (part – the proposed rural parish ward of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe); Middleton parish; Overton parish)
Poulton	Poulton ward (part)

Ward name	Constituent areas
Primrose	Bulk ward (part); John O'Gaunt ward (part)
Scotforth	Scotforth East ward (part); Scotforth West ward (part)
Skerton Central	Skerton Central ward (part); Skerton West ward (part)
Skerton East	Skerton Central ward (part); Skerton East ward
Skerton West	Overton ward (part – the proposed Winster Park parish ward of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish); Skerton West ward (part)
Slyne & Kellet	Kellet ward (part – the parish of Nether Kellet), Slyne-with-Hest ward (the parish of Slyne-with-Hest)
Torrisholme	Torrisholme ward (part)
Westgate	Harbour ward (part); Heysham North ward (part); Overton ward (part – the proposed Westgate parish ward of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish), Torrisholme ward (part); Victoria ward (part)

Figure B2: Lancaster City Council's Proposals: Number of Councillors and Electors by Ward

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Arkholme	1	1,542	1,542	-7	1,620	1,620	-6
Bare	2	3,100	1,550	-7	3,150	1,575	-8
Bolton-le-Sands	2	3,375	1,688	2	3,430	1,715	0
Bowerham	2	3,448	1,724	4	3,670	1,835	7
Broadway	3	4,660	1,553	-6	4,760	1,587	-7
Bulk	2	3,117	1,559	-6	3,130	1,565	-9
Carnforth	3	4,993	1,664	0	5,040	1,680	-2
Caton	2	3,161	1,581	-5	3,210	1,605	-6
Ellel	2	3,110	1,555	-6	3,270	1,635	-5
Freehold	2	3,224	1,612	-3	3,480	1,740	1
Hala	2	3,744	1,872	13	3,770	1,885	10
Halton	1	1,810	1,810	9	1,840	1,840	7
Heysham South	3	5,000	1,667	0	5,310	1,770	3
Hornby	1	1,776	1,776	7	1,820	1,820	6
John O'Gaunt	2	3,528	1,764	6	3,610	1,805	5
Marsh	2	2,756	1,378	-17	3,150	1,575	-8

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (1999)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2004)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Overton	1	1,350	1,350	-19	1,390	1,390	-19
Poulton	2	3,370	1,685	2	3,450	1,725	1
Primrose	2	3,432	1,716	3	3,500	1,750	2
Scotforth	2	2,906	1,453	-12	3,500	1,750	2
Skerton Central	2	3,470	1,735	5	3,500	1,750	2
Skerton East	2	3,400	1,700	2	3,440	1,720	0
Skerton West	2	3,600	1,800	8	3,620	1,810	6
Slyne & Kellet	2	3,196	1,598	-4	3,240	1,620	-6
Torrisholme	2	3,230	1,615	-3	3,240	1,620	-6
Westgate	3	4,650	1,550	-7	4,820	1,607	-6

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lancaster 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. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

APPENDIX C

The Statutory Provisions

Local Government Act 1992: the Commission's Role

1 Section 13(2) of the Local Government Act 1992 places a duty on the Commission to undertake periodic electoral reviews of each principal local authority area in England, and to make recommendations to the Secretary of State. Section 13(3) provides that, so far as reasonably practicable, the first such review of any area should be undertaken not less than 10 years, and not more than 15 years, after this Commission's predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), submitted an initial electoral review report on the county within which that area, or the larger part of the area, was located. This timetable applies to districts within shire and metropolitan counties, although not to South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear¹. Nor does the timetable apply to London boroughs; the 1992 Act is silent on the timing of periodic electoral reviews in Greater London. Nevertheless, these areas will be included in the Commission's review programme. The Commission has no power to review the electoral arrangements of the City of London.

2 Under section 13(5) of the 1992 Act, the Commission is required to make recommendations to the Secretary of State for any changes to the electoral arrangements within the areas of English principal authorities as appear desirable to it, having regard to the need to:

- (a) reflect the identities and interests of local communities; and
- (b) secure effective and convenient local government.

3 In reporting to the Secretary of State, the Commission may make recommendations for such changes to electoral arrangements as are specified in section 14(4) of the 1992 Act. In relation to principal authorities, these are:

- (a) the total number of councillors to be elected to the council;
- (b) the number and boundaries of electoral areas (wards or divisions);
- (c) the number of councillors to be elected for each electoral area, and the years in which they are to be elected; and
- (d) the name of any electoral area.

¹ The Local Government Boundary Commission did not submit reports on the counties of South Yorkshire and Tyne and Wear.

4 Unlike the LGBC, the Commission may also make recommendations for changes in respect of electoral arrangements within parish and town council areas. Accordingly, in relation to parish or town councils within a principal authority's area, the Commission may make recommendations relating to:

- (a) the number of councillors;
- (b) the need for parish wards;
- (c) the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- (d) the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- (e) the name of any such ward.

5 In conducting the review, section 27 of the 1992 Act requires the Commission to comply, so far as is practicable, with the rules given in Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972 for the conduct of electoral reviews.

Local Government Act 1972: Rules to be Observed in Considering Electoral Arrangements

6 By virtue of section 27 of the Local Government Act 1992, in undertaking a review of electoral arrangements the Commission is required to comply so far as is reasonably practicable with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. For ease of reference, those provisions of Schedule 11 which are relevant to this review are set out below.

7 In relation to shire districts:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the district likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration (by the Secretary of State or the Commission):

- (a) the ratio of the number of local government electors to the number of councillors to be elected shall be, as nearly as may be, the same in every ward in the district;
- (b) in a district every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district;
- (c) in a district every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the district.

8 The Schedule also provides that, subject to (a)–(c) above, regard should be had to:

- (d) the desirability of fixing ward boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (e) any local ties which would be broken by the fixing of any particular ward boundary.

9 The Schedule provides that, in considering whether a parish should be divided into wards, regard shall be had to whether:

- (f) the number or distribution of electors in the parish is such as to make a single election of parish councillors impracticable or inconvenient; and
- (g) it is desirable that any area or areas of the parish should be separately represented on the parish council.

10 Where it is decided to divide any such parish into parish wards, in considering the size and boundaries of the wards and fixing the number of parish councillors to be elected for each ward, regard shall be had to:

- (h) any change in the number or distribution of electors of the parish which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the consideration;
- (i) the desirability of fixing boundaries which are and will remain easily identifiable; and
- (j) any local ties which will be broken by the fixing of any particular boundaries.

11 Where it is decided not to divide the parish into parish wards, in fixing the number of councillors to be elected for each parish regard shall be had to the number and distribution of electors of the parish and any change which is likely to take place within the period of five years immediately following the fixing of the number of parish councillors.