

Draft recommendations on the
future electoral arrangements for
Hyndburn in Lancashire

February 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 councils in the borough.

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

© 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>23</i>
APPENDICES	
A Hyndburn Borough Council's, Hyndburn Conservative Association's and Hyndburn Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements	<i>25</i>
B The Statutory Provisions	<i>31</i>

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

SUMMARY

The Commission began a review of the electoral arrangements for Hyndburn 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 Hyndburn:

- **in nine of the 17 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough and four wards vary by more than 20 per cent from the average;**
- **by 2004 electoral equality is expected to improve slightly, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10 per cent from the average in seven wards and by more than 20 per cent in four wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (Figures 1 and 2 and paragraphs 85-86) are that:

- **Hyndburn Borough Council should have 35 councillors, 12 fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 16 wards, instead of 17 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one;**
- **elections should continue to take place by thirds.**

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

- **In 15 of the proposed 16 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10 per cent from the borough average.**
- **This improved level of electoral equality is expected to improve further, with the number of electors per councillor in all 16 wards expected to vary by no more than 10 per cent from the average for the borough in 2004.**

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

- **We will consult on our draft recommendations for eight weeks from 15 February 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 10 April 2000:

**Review Manager
Hyndburn 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**

Figure 1: The Commission's Draft Recommendations: Summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1 Altham	2	Altham ward; Church ward (part); Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
2 Barnfield	2	Barnfield ward; Baxenden ward (part)
3 Baxenden	2	Baxenden ward (part)
4 Central	2	Central ward; Milnshaw ward (part)
5 Church	2	Church ward (part)
6 Clayton-le-Moors	2	Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
7 Huncoat	2	Huncoat ward (part)
8 Immanuel	2	Immanuel ward (part); Spring Hill ward (part)
9 Netherton	2	Netherton ward (part)
10 Overton	3	Netherton ward (part); Overton ward
11 Peel	2	Huncoat ward (part); Peel ward (part)
12 Rishton	3	Eachill ward; Norden ward
13 St Andrew's	2	St Andrew's ward (part)
14 St Mary's	2	Milnshaw ward (part)
15 St Oswald's	3	Immanuel ward (part); St Andrew's ward (part); St Oswald's ward
16 Spring Hill	2	Spring Hill ward (part)

Notes: 1 There is one parish in Hyndburn, Altham, which is wholly contained within the proposed Altham ward.

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

Figure 2: The Commission's Draft Recommendations for Hyndburn

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 Altham	2	3,002	1,501	-13	3,556	1,778	1
2 Barnfield	2	3,513	1,757	2	3,514	1,757	0
3 Baxenden	2	3,417	1,709	0	3,420	1,710	-2
4 Central	2	3,556	1,778	4	3,557	1,779	2
5 Church	2	3,659	1,830	7	3,660	1,830	4
6 Clayton-le-Moors	2	3,559	1,780	4	3,562	1,781	2
7 Huncoat	2	3,291	1,646	-4	3,393	1,697	-3
8 Immanuel	2	3,516	1,758	2	3,528	1,764	1
9 Netherton	2	3,436	1,718	0	3,439	1,720	-2
10 Overton	3	4,861	1,620	-6	5,052	1,684	-4
11 Peel	2	3,393	1,697	-1	3,394	1,697	-3
12 Rishton	3	5,135	1,712	0	5,203	1,734	-1
13 St Andrew's	2	3,185	1,593	-7	3,470	1,735	-1
14 St Mary's	2	3,682	1,841	7	3,683	1,842	5
15 St Oswald's	3	5,190	1,730	1	5,201	1,734	-1
16 Spring Hill	2	3,679	1,840	7	3,680	1,840	5
Totals	35	60,074	-	-	61,312	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,716	-	-	1,752	-

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

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

1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our draft recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Hyndburn in Lancashire 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 Hyndburn. The last such review was undertaken by our predecessor, the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBC), which reported to the Secretary of State in October 1975 (Report No. 67). 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 B).

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

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 Second, 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 Third, 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, i.e. in year one half of the borough 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 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 would continue in many authorities.

11 Following publication of the White Paper, we advised all authorities in our 1998/99 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 our *Guidance*. Nevertheless, we considered that local authorities and other interested parties might wish to have regard to the Secretary of State’s intentions and legislative proposals in formulating electoral schemes as part of PERs of their areas. 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 Hyndburn Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified Lancashire County Council,

Lancashire Police Authority, the local authority associations, Lancashire Association of Parish and Town Councils, the parish council 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 Borough 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 15 February 2000 and will end on 10 April 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 The borough of Hyndburn is situated on the northern fringe of industrial Lancashire and covers an area of 7,315 hectares. Hyndburn is bordered to the south and west by Blackburn, to the east by Burnley and by Ribble Valley to the north. The borough comprises the town of Accrington and the smaller urban settlements of Clayton-le-Moors, Great Harwood, Oswaldtwistle and Rishton. It contains one parish, Altham, which is situated in the north-east of the borough. The Leeds & Liverpool Canal bisects the borough and the M6 and M62 provide good access to the major urban conurbations of the North West.

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 borough 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 borough is 60,074 (February 1999). The council presently has 47 members who are elected from 17 wards, six of which are relatively urban, with the remainder being predominantly rural in character. Fourteen of the wards are each represented by three councillors, two are represented by two councillors each and one is a single-member ward. The council is elected by thirds.

19 Since the last electoral review there has been a decrease in the electorate in Hyndburn borough, with around 1.5 per cent fewer electors than two decades ago. The most notable decrease has been in the wards covering Accrington, where there are approximately 900 fewer electors than 20 years ago. Conversely, the areas of Altham, Rishton and Oswaldtwistle have seen an increase in electorate since the last electoral review.

20 At present, each councillor represents an average of 1,278 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 1,305 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 nine of the 17 wards varies by more than 10 per cent from the borough average and by more than 20 per cent in four wards. The worst imbalance is in Clayton-le-Moors ward where the councillor represents 28 per cent more electors than the borough average.

Map 1: Existing Wards in Hyndburn

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 Altham	1	1,127	1,127	-12	1,404	1,404	8
2 Barnfield	3	2,907	969	-24	2,908	969	-26
3 Baxenden	3	4,023	1,341	5	4,026	1,342	3
4 Central	3	3,232	1,077	-16	3,233	1,078	-17
5 Church	3	4,173	1,391	9	4,174	1,391	7
6 Clayton-le-Moors	3	4,920	1,640	28	5,198	1,733	33
7 Eachill	2	2,552	1,276	0	2,553	1,277	-2
8 Huncoat	3	3,304	1,101	-14	3,406	1,135	-13
9 Immanuel	3	3,803	1,268	-1	3,819	1,273	-2
10 Milnshaw	3	4,006	1,335	4	4,007	1,336	2
11 Netherton	3	3,650	1,217	-5	3,655	1,218	-7
12 Norden	2	2,583	1,292	1	2,650	1,325	2
13 Overton	3	4,647	1,549	21	4,838	1,613	24
14 Peel	3	3,380	1,127	-12	3,381	1,127	-14
15 St Andrew's	3	3,265	1,088	-15	3,550	1,183	-9
16 St Oswald's	3	4,794	1,598	25	4,801	1,600	23
17 Spring Hill	3	3,708	1,236	-3	3,709	1,236	-5
Totals	47	60,074	–	–	61,312	–	–
Averages	–	–	1,278	–	–	1,305	–

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

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 1999, electors in Barnfield ward were relatively over-represented by 24 per cent, while electors in Clayton-le-Moors ward were relatively under-represented by 28 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 Hyndburn Borough Council and its constituent parish council.

22 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the Commission met with officers and members from the Borough Council. We are most grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received four representations during Stage One, including proposals from the Borough Council, from Hyndburn Conservative Association and Hyndburn Labour Party, all of which may be inspected at the offices of the Borough Council and the Commission.

Hyndburn Borough Council

23 Hyndburn Borough Council proposed a reduction in council size from 47 to the “mid-thirties”, representing 16 wards, rather than the current 17, with a mix of two- and three-member wards.

24 The Council stated that its submission was not a detailed borough-wide scheme and only included proposals for ward boundaries where cross-party consensus had been achieved. It stated that the proposed wards would reflect a local initiative to create five area councils in Hyndburn; Accrington North including Huncoat; Accrington South including Baxenden; Clayton & Church; Great Harwood & Rishton; and Oswaldtwistle. The Borough Council proposed modifying the boundaries of the wards of Clayton-le-Moors, Altham, Springhill and Immanuel and combining the wards of Norden and Eachill to form a new Rishton ward. It also recommended minor boundary modifications to Huncoat and Peel wards. It made no comment on nine of the existing wards. The scheme would improve electoral equality in those areas covered by its submission. The Borough Council’s proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

Conservative Groups

25 Hyndburn Conservative Association proposed a reduction in the council size from 47 to 35 members, providing for 13 two-member wards and three three-member wards, and argued for the introduction of predominantly two-member wards in the light of the “possible introduction of biennial elections”. However it proposed that the wards of Overton, Rishton and St Oswald’s each be represented by three members to provide better electoral equality.

26 Hyndburn Conservative Association supported Hyndburn Borough Council’s proposals for the wards of Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Eachill, Huncoat, Immanuel and Norden, but additionally proposed significant boundary modifications to the wards of Barnfield, Central, Church and Springfield, with minor amendments proposed for Baxenden, Milnshaw and Peel wards. It proposed no change to four wards.

27 Under its proposals six wards would initially have an electoral variance of more than 10 per cent from the borough average, with all wards having a variance of less than 10 per cent in 2004. Hyndburn Conservative Association’s proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

28 The North West Conservatives supported the proposals submitted by Hyndburn Conservative Association.

Hyndburn Labour Party

29 Hyndburn Labour Party put forward proposals for a 36-member council, on the basis that 36 councillors could more efficiently fulfill a range of “useful roles and duties rather than the present 47”. The Labour Group also stated a preference for two-member wards, but acknowledged that they do not necessarily provide for high levels of electoral equality. It therefore proposed 15 two-member wards and two three-member wards, Overton and Rishton. It proposed creating a new West ward, comprising parts of Church ward, St Andrew’s ward and St Oswald’s ward. The Labour Group put forward similar proposals to those of the Borough Council and the Conservative Association in the rest of the borough, for the current wards of Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Eachill, Huncoat, Immanuel, Netherton, Norden and Overton.

30 Under Hyndburn Labour Party’s scheme, only Central, Huncoat, Peel and Spring Hill wards would remain unchanged. However the Labour Group acknowledged that the wards of Spring Hill and Central might require some small modifications to improve electoral equality.

31 Hyndburn Labour Party’s proposals are summarised in Appendix A.

4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

32 As described earlier, our prime objective in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Hyndburn 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 identities and interests of local communities – and Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972, which refers to the number of electors per councillor being “as nearly as may be, the same in every ward of the district or borough”.

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 while we accept that the achievement of absolute electoral equality for the authority as a whole is likely to be unattainable, 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 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 Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2004, projecting an increase in the electorate of 2 per cent from 60,074 to 61,132 over the five-year period from 1999 to 2004. It expects most of the growth to be in Altham, Clayton-le-Moors and St Andrew’s wards, with approximately 300 more electors in each ward by 2004. The Council has provided numbers and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the Borough Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

37 We accept that forecasting electorates is an inexact science and, having given consideration to the Borough Council’s figures, are content that they represent the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

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 Hyndburn Borough Council presently has 47 members. All the representations received during Stage One proposed a radical reduction in council size. The Borough Council proposed a reduction in council size to “somewhere in the mid-thirties”, while the Conservative Association and the Labour Group proposed a 35- and 36-member council size, respectively.

40 The leaders of both the Conservative and Labour groups expressed a “desire to introduce biennial elections, resulting in each ward being represented by two-members wherever practicable”. They also stated a desire to “establish a cabinet and scrutiny committee and reduce the number of existing committees in order to better utilise elected members’ time”. The Council expressed hope that this would “enable members to have more time engaging the electorate” and it considered that “future committee membership of around 10 to 12 will help make them less cumbersome and more efficient”. We are aware that the Council has drawn up a draft constitution for the revised political structure and has also begun training sessions for members “to prepare them for their new roles”. The Borough Council has provided us with a copy of its draft constitution which illustrates how the Council’s work would be divided and how many members would sit on each committee.

41 The Commission has noted that Hyndburn Borough Council has given the necessary consideration to the internal political management, the role of councillors and the implications both for the council and for residents in the proposed new structure. We also note the cross-party consensus which a reduction in the number of councillors enjoys.

42 Having considered the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the representations received, we have therefore concluded that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 35 members. We would welcome further views on this issue during Stage Three.

Electoral Arrangements

43 We have considered carefully all the representations received, including the borough-wide schemes from Hyndburn Conservative Association and Hyndburn Labour Party and the proposals from the Borough Council. All three schemes would result in some improvements in electoral equality.

44 As outlined earlier, we propose adopting a 35-member council, a reduction in council size of 12. We propose basing our draft recommendations on elements of all the schemes received from respondents, wherever possible reflecting cross-party consensus. We have also attempted to reflect the five community areas of Accrington North, Accrington South, Clayton-le-Moors & Church, Oswaldtwistle and Great Harwood & Rishton.

45 We have, however, moved away from the proposals received in order to improve electoral equality further and to provide identifiable boundaries and a coherent warding pattern.

46 We consider that these proposals strike the best balance presently available between electoral equality and the statutory criteria. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on the existing wards of the proposed area councils, are considered in turn:

- (a) Huncoat, Milnshaw and Peel wards;
- (b) Barnfield, Baxenden, Central and Spring Hill wards;
- (c) Altham, Church and Clayton-le-Moors wards;
- (d) Immanuel, St Andrew's and St Oswald's wards;
- (e) Eachill, Netherton, Norden and Overton wards.

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

Huncoat, Milnshaw and Peel wards

47 These three wards lie in the east of the borough. The wards of Milnshaw and Peel are predominantly urban while Huncoat ward combines both urban and rural areas. All three wards are each presently represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements Huncoat ward and Peel ward are both over-represented by 14 per cent and 12 per cent respectively (13 per cent and 14 per cent by 2004) while Milnshaw ward is under-represented by 4 per cent (2 per cent by 2004).

48 In this area the Borough Council recommended that 25 electors, from Oak Bank, should be transferred from Altham ward to Huncoat ward, and that numbers 38-48 Hodder Street should be transferred from Huncoat ward to Peel ward. It proposed that each ward be represented by two councillors, it did not propose any further amendments.

49 The Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposed boundary realignment for both Huncoat ward and Peel ward but proposed further modifications to Milnshaw ward and Peel ward. It suggested that 26 voters, west of Eastgate, should be transferred from Peel ward into Central ward. It also proposed that 143 electors, south of and including Pollard Street and part of Owen Street, should be transferred from Milnshaw ward to Peel ward. Finally in this area it recommended that the area west of Whalley Road and north of Moorhead High School should be transferred from Milnshaw ward to Church ward.

50 Hyndburn Labour Party supported the Borough Council's proposed boundary realignment for Huncoat ward and Peel ward but proposed further modifications to Milnshaw ward. It suggested that between 500 and 600 electors in polling districts GA and GB should be transferred from Milnshaw ward to Church ward.

51 Having considered carefully all representations received, we endorse the proposal that this area be represented by three two-member wards. We propose modifications to the wards of Huncoat and Peel, adopting the council's proposals to include electors in Hodder Street, currently in Huncoat ward, in Peel ward. We do not propose adopting the Borough Council's scheme to

include the 25 electors of Oak Bank from Altham ward in Huncoat ward. This would require the creation of a parish ward of 25 electors within Altham parish which we do not consider would provide convenient and effective local government at parish level.

52 We do however, propose realigning the boundary between the wards of Central and Milnshaw to include those electors west of Whalley Road, south of York Street, west of Lupin Road and to the south of the properties on Lupin Close. This would, however, result in Milnshaw Park being included in Central ward rather than Milnshaw ward and we therefore propose that the name of Milnshaw ward should be changed to reflect the area covered. We propose that this ward be renamed St Mary's, as St Mary Magdalen's Church and Primary School are situated in the centre of the new ward. However we would welcome local views on the proposed ward name during Stage Three.

53 We do not consider that the proposals put forward by Hyndburn Conservative Association and Hyndburn Labour Party, for modifications to the boundaries of Milnshaw ward, would improve electoral equality whilst providing clear, identifiable boundaries, and propose no further modifications to these wards.

54 Under our recommendations Huncoat ward and Peel ward would be over-represented by 4 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (3 per cent in both wards by 2004) and St Mary's ward under-represented by 7 per cent (5 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

Barnfield, Baxenden, Central and Spring Hill wards

55 These four wards are situated in the south-east of the borough. Central ward is a predominantly urban ward comprising part of Accrington town, while Barnfield ward and Spring Hill ward comprise the urban outskirts of Accrington and neighbouring rural areas. Baxenden ward covers the town of Baxenden and surrounding rural area. Currently all four wards are each represented by three councillors. Barnfield ward, Central ward and Spring Hill ward are all over-represented under the present arrangements by 24 per cent, 16 per cent and 3 per cent respectively (26 per cent, 17 per cent and 5 per cent by 2004). Baxenden ward is currently under-represented by 5 per cent (3 per cent by 2004).

56 The Borough Council proposed no change to the boundaries of Barnfield ward, Baxenden ward and Central ward and suggested a boundary modification to Spring Hill ward, involving the inclusion of 29 electors in the area of Green Haworth and Bedlam, in Immanuel ward (detailed later in this chapter).

57 The Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposed boundary realignment for Spring Hill ward but suggested further boundary changes to Spring Hill ward and to the wards of Barnfield, Baxenden and Central. It proposed transferring those electors to the west of Oakhill Park from Baxenden ward to Barnfield ward and including those electors in the north-east of Spring Hill ward in Barnfield ward. It also proposed alterations to Central ward, suggesting that 26 voters, west of Eastgate, should be transferred from Peel ward into Central ward. Under its proposals Central ward would also incorporate electors to the south of Blackburn Road and to the east of Lower Antley Reservoir, currently in Church ward, as well as the area

between Blackburn Road and the Sports Centre also in Church ward. Finally in this area the Conservative Association proposed the transfer of electors between Charter Street and Willows Lane, currently in Central ward, to Spring Hill ward.

58 The Labour Group supported the Borough Council's proposed boundary realignment for Spring Hill ward, proposing no further modifications to the boundaries of Central ward and Spring Hill ward. It proposed modifying the boundary between Barnfield and Baxenden, suggesting that the boundary should run along the north of Bamford Crescent, down the middle of Manchester Road, around Haworth Park and then along Royds Avenue up to and including Oak Hill Park.

59 Having considered carefully all representations we propose that the area be represented by four two-member wards. Central ward would comprise an area similar to the current ward, with an additional 324 electors, from the area south of York Street, including Milnshaw Gardens and Milnshaw Park, being transferred from Milnshaw ward, as outlined earlier. We do not propose any further modifications to the boundaries of Central ward.

60 We are proposing a modified Spring Hill ward, based on the Borough Council's proposals. Our proposed Spring Hill ward would cover an area similar to the existing ward, less 29 electors in Green Haworth and Bedlam who would be included in Immanuel ward. We do not propose any further alterations to Spring Hill ward.

61 We have accepted the principle of the Labour Group's modification to the boundary between Barnfield ward and Baxenden ward; however we propose an alternative boundary. Barnfield ward will comprise the existing ward and the area, currently in Baxenden ward, to the north of Bamford Crescent, west of Whalley Road and north of Harcourt Road and the footpath which bisects the King George V Playing Fields. Baxenden ward would comprise the remainder of the existing ward. This would also result in marginally better electoral equality and, in our opinion, would make for a more identifiable boundary than that proposed by the Labour Group.

62 We do not propose adopting Hyndburn Conservative Association's recommended boundary modifications for the wards of Barnfield, Baxenden and Central, as we consider our proposals offer clear and identifiable boundaries and better electoral equality, whilst reflecting the statutory criteria.

63 Under our proposals Barnfield ward will be 2 per cent above the borough average (becoming equal to the average in 2004) and Baxenden ward will be equal to the borough average (2 per cent below by 2004). The proposals for the wards of Central and Spring Hill would result in the wards having an electoral variance of 4 per cent and 7 per cent from the borough average respectively (2 per cent and 5 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

Altham, Church and Clayton-le-Moors wards

64 These three wards cover the north-east of the borough. The ward of Altham is predominantly rural and includes the parish of Altham and an unparished area. Clayton-le-Moors ward contains the settlement of Clayton and surrounding rural areas while Church ward covers the settlement

of Church and its surrounding rural area. Church ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward are each currently represented by three councillors with one councillor representing Altham ward. Church ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward are currently both under-represented by 9 per cent and 28 per cent respectively (7 per cent and 33 per cent by 2004) while Altham ward is over-represented by 12 per cent (forecast to be under-represented by 8 per cent in 2004).

65 The Borough Council proposed boundary alterations to the wards of Altham and Clayton-le-Moors but recommended no change to Church ward. As stated earlier it proposed including 25 electors in the Oak Bank area of Altham ward in Huncoat ward. It also proposed realigning the boundary between Altham ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward to improve electoral equality, thus including the electors to the east of Whalley Road and Clayton-le-Moors industrial estate and south of Church Street and Pickup Street, in Altham ward.

66 Hyndburn Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposals for Altham ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward, however it proposed that Altham ward should be renamed Clayton North, and Clayton-le-Moors ward should be renamed Clayton South. It put forward an alternative boundary alignment for Church ward. It recommended that the area of Milnshaw ward, west of Whalley Road and north of Moorhead High School should be included in Church ward, while electors to the south of Blackburn Road and east of Lower Antley Reservoir and the area between Blackburn Road and the Sports Centre should be transferred from Church ward to Central ward.

67 Hyndburn Labour Party supported the Borough Council's proposals for Altham ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward; however it put forward alternative proposals for the boundaries of Church ward. It also suggested that the ward of Altham should be renamed Altham & Clayton. It proposed that part of Church ward, south of Blackburn Road, Henry Street and the Sports Centre and west of Swiss Street and Poyland Street be transferred into the proposed West ward. It also suggested that between 500 and 600 electors in polling districts GA and GB should be transferred from Milnshaw ward to Church ward, as outlined earlier.

68 Having considered carefully all the representations submitted, we propose a number of modifications to the ward boundaries in this area. We accept the Borough Council's proposal that the wards of Altham, Church and Clayton-le-Moors should each be represented by two councillors, but propose an alternative boundary realignment, between Altham ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward, to improve electoral equality further. We propose realigning the boundary so that it would run along Whalley Road, also providing a more clearly identifiable boundary.

69 We further propose transferring 514 electors, north of Queens Road West and north of the footpath that runs across the land to the north of Dill Hall Farm, currently in Church ward, to Altham ward. This boundary modification in Altham ward results in good levels of electoral equality while providing a clearly identifiable boundary.

70 We do not propose adopting Hyndburn Conservative Association's or Hyndburn Labour Party's proposed boundary alterations for Church ward as we consider that our proposed boundary modifications would provide better electoral equality whilst reflecting the statutory criteria. Given the absence of local support expressed during Stage One, we do not propose renaming Altham ward as Altham & Clayton or Clayton North or renaming Clayton-le-Moors

ward as Clayton South. We would welcome local people's comments on alternative ward names for Altham and Clayton-le-Moors wards during Stage Three.

71 These recommendations would result in an electoral variance of 13 per cent in Altham ward initially, however this would improve to 1 per cent in 2004. Under our proposals Church ward and Clayton-le-Moors ward would have electoral variances of 7 per cent and 4 per cent respectively (improving to 4 per cent and 2 per cent respectively in 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

Immanuel, St Andrew's and St Oswald's wards

72 These three wards cover the south-west corner of the borough and are currently each represented by three councillors. Immanuel ward and St Andrew's ward are currently over-represented by 1 per cent and 15 per cent respectively (2 per cent and 9 per cent by 2004), while St Oswald's ward is under-represented by 25 per cent (23 per cent in 2004).

73 The Borough Council proposed realigning the boundary of Immanuel ward, transferring 29 electors in the Green Haworth and Bedlam area from Spring Hill ward to Immanuel ward. It made no proposals for change to St Oswald's or St Andrew's wards.

74 Hyndburn Conservative Association supported the Borough Council's proposals for Immanuel ward and recommended that St Oswald's ward be represented by three councillors rather than the two proposed by the Borough Council. It made no further recommendations for these wards.

75 Hyndburn Labour Party supported the Borough Council's proposal to include 29 electors from Spring Hill ward in Immanuel ward. It further proposed creating a new West ward. The proposed West ward would comprise 1,347 electors from the east of St Oswald's ward, 620 electors from the north-west of St Andrew's ward as well as the electors from Church ward mentioned earlier. The Labour Group also recommended that 420 electors should be transferred from Immanuel ward to St Andrew's ward to compensate for electors lost to the proposed new ward. The Labour Group considered that this new ward was necessary as it "regarded three-member wards as less satisfactory, [and had] tried to identify areas in Oswaldtwistle which would be the right size for two-member wards".

76 It is open to the Commission to recommend single, two or three-member wards in attempting to balance electoral equality against the statutory criteria. Given the evidence available at this time, we do not consider that the creation of a new West ward would best achieve electoral equality, while having regard to the statutory criteria. The Labour Group's proposed West ward comprises a number of disparate communities, as does the existing St Oswald's ward, which covers the individual settlements of Knuzden Brook, Belthorn and parts of Oswaldtwistle. We have therefore looked at the various possibilities of creating alternative warding arrangements in the area that would give good electoral equality whilst separately reflecting these individual communities criteria. However, we found that there were no viable alternatives which would result in comparable levels of electoral equality while more accurately reflecting the definable communities.

77 Having considered carefully all the representations received we are proposing the retention of much of the current ward pattern, but recommend slight modifications to improve electoral equality. We propose adopting the Borough Council and Hyndburn Conservative Association's proposal that the wards of Immanuel and St Andrew's should each be represented by two councillors, but concur with the Conservative Group's view that the electorate of St Oswald's ward merits three councillors. However, we propose realigning the boundary between the wards of St Oswald's, St Andrew's and Immanuel to improve electoral equality. We recommend that 316 electors to the west of New Lane and to the north of Duckworth Hill Lane, currently in Immanuel ward, should be included in St Oswald's ward. We also recommend that 80 electors in St Andrew's ward, south of Stanhill Lane, should be included in St Oswald's ward. Finally in this area we are adopting the Borough Council's proposal to include 29 electors of Green Haworth and Bedlam, currently in Spring Hill ward, in Immanuel ward, as outlined earlier. We consider that these boundary alterations would provide clearly identifiable boundaries and improved electoral equality.

78 Our draft recommendations would result in Immanuel ward and St Oswald's ward being under-represented by 2 per cent and 1 per cent respectively (1 per cent and over-represented by 1 per cent respectively in 2004) while St Andrew's ward would be over-represented by 7 per cent (1 per cent by 2004). Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

Eachill, Netherton, Norden and Overton wards

79 These four wards lie in the north-west of the borough, covering the settlements of Great Harwood and Rishton. The wards of Eachill and Norden are each currently represented by two councillors while Netherton and Overton wards each elect three councillors. The number of electors per councillor in Eachill ward is currently equal to the borough average, while electors in Netherton ward are currently over-represented by 5 per cent (over-represented by 2 per cent and 7 per cent by 2004). Norden and Overton wards are both currently under-represented by 1 per cent and 21 per cent respectively (2 per cent and 24 per cent by 2004).

80 The Borough Council proposed that there should be no alteration to Overton ward or to the boundaries of Netherton ward. However, it proposed that Netherton be represented by two councillors rather than the current three. It also proposed that the wards of Eachill and Norden should be combined in a new Rishton ward, represented by three councillors.

81 Hyndburn Conservative Association and Hyndburn Labour Party supported the Borough Council's proposals for Eachill, Netherton, Norden and Overton wards.

82 Given the improvements to electoral equality and the support expressed for these proposals we are adopting the Borough Council's scheme in this area, with one minor boundary modification. In order to make further improvements to electoral equality, while reflecting existing communities and providing a clear boundary, we propose including 214 electors, from Netherton ward, in Overton ward. Our proposed boundary would run along Balfour Street before running north, taking in all of the properties on Shaftesbury Avenue. Our proposals are illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover.

83 Our draft recommendations would result in the number of electors per councillor in the wards of Netherton and Rishton being equal to the borough average, (over-represented by 2 per cent and 1 per cent by 2004), while Overton ward would have a variance of 6 per cent below the borough average (4 per cent by 2004).

Electoral Cycle

84 At Stage One we received no proposals in relation to the electoral cycle of the borough. Accordingly, we make no recommendation for change to the present system of elections by thirds.

Conclusions

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

- (a) there should be a reduction in council size from 47 to 35;
- (b) there should be 16 wards, one fewer than at present;
- (c) the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of one ward;
- (d) elections should continue to be held by thirds.

86 Our draft recommendations would involve modifications to all of the existing wards in Hyndburn borough, as summarised below:

- (a) we propose that the Borough Council's recommendations should be adopted in Eachill, Norden, Peel and Spring Hill wards. We also propose that its recommendations for Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Huncoat and Immanuel wards should be broadly endorsed with minor alterations to improve electoral equality.
- (b) in Oswaldtwistle we propose to broadly adopt the Conservative scheme modifying it to improve electoral equality.
- (c) we propose that the modified Barnfield and Baxenden wards are broadly based on the Hyndburn Labour Party's recommendations, with modifications to improve electoral equality and provide clear, identifiable boundaries.
- (d) we propose modifications to Central, Church, Milnshaw, Netherton and Overton wards, to facilitate electoral equality.

87 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	47	35	47	35
Number of wards	17	16	17	16
Average number of electors per councillor	1,278	1,716	1,305	1,752
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	9	1	7	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	4	0	4	0

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

Draft Recommendation
 Hyndburn Borough Council should comprise 35 councillors serving 16 wards, as detailed and named in Figures 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and the large map inside the back cover. The Council should continue to hold elections by thirds.

89 We have not finalised our conclusions on the electoral arrangements for Hyndburn and welcome comments from the Borough 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 Hyndburn

5 NEXT STEPS

90 We are putting forward draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Hyndburn. Now it is up to the people of the area. We will take fully into account all representations received by 10 April 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 Borough Council, and a list of respondents will be available on request from the Commission after the end of the consultation period.

91 Views may be expressed by writing directly to us:

Review Manager
Hyndburn 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

92 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

Hyndburn Borough Council's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Hyndburn Borough Council did not submit a borough-wide scheme, however they did make recommendations for areas in which there was cross-party consensus, where the Borough Council's proposals were as follows:

Figure A1: Hyndburn Borough Council's Proposal: Constituent Areas

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Altham	2	Altham ward (part); Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
2	Clayton-le-Moors	2	Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
3	Huncoat	2	Huncoat ward (part); Altham ward (part)
4	Immanuel	2	Immanuel ward; Spring Hill ward (part)
5	Netherton	2	Netherton ward
6	Overton	3	Overton ward
7	Peel	2	Peel ward (part); Huncoat ward (part)
8	Rishton	3	Eachill ward; Norden ward
9	Spring Hill	2	Spring Hill ward (part)

Figure A2: Hyndburn Borough 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 %
1 Altham	2	2,941	1,471	-17	3,219	1,610	-11
2 Clayton-le-Moors	2	3,081	1,541	-13	3,359	1,680	-7
3 Huncoat	2	3,316	1,658	-6	3,418	1,709	-5
4 Immanual	2	3,832	1,916	8	3,848	1,924	7
5 Netherton	2	3,650	1,825	3	3,655	1,828	1
6 Overton	3	4,647	1,549	-12	4,838	1,613	-11
7 Peel	2	3,393	1,697	-4	3,394	1,697	-6
8 Rishton	3	5,135	1,712	-3	5,203	1,734	-4
9 Spring Hill	2	3,679	1,840	4	3,680	1,840	2

Source: Electorate figures are based on Hyndburn Borough Council's submission.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number. The 'variance from average' for these wards are based on a council size of 34.

Although the Borough Council, the Conservative Association and the Labour Group agreed on the boundary alterations to Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Huncoat, Netherton and Overton, the figures supplied in the three submissions are not the same. The above figures are those which were included in the Borough Council's submission.

Hyndburn Conservative Association's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Conservative Association in all but one ward, where the Conservative Association's proposals were as follows:

Figure A3: Hyndburn Conservative Association's Proposal: Constituent Areas

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Barnfield	2	Barnfield ward; Baxenden ward (part); Spring Hill ward (part)
2	Baxenden	2	Baxenden ward (part)
3	Central	2	Barnfield ward (part); Central ward (part); Church ward (part); Peel ward (part)
4	Church	2	Church ward (part); Milnshaw ward (part)
5	Clayton North	2	Altham ward (part); Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
6	Clayton South	2	Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
7	Huncoat	2	Huncoat ward (part); Altham ward (part)
8	Immanuel	2	Immanuel ward; Spring Hill ward (part)
9	Milnshaw	2	Milnshaw ward (part)
10	Netherton	2	Netherton ward
11	Overton	3	Overton ward
12	Peel	2	Peel ward (part); Huncoat ward (part); Milnshaw ward (part)
13	St Andrew's	2	St Andrew's ward
14	St Oswald's	3	St Oswald's ward
15	Spring Hill	2	Spring Hill ward (part); Central ward (part)

Figure A4: Hyndburn Conservative Association'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 %
1 Barnfield	2	3,782	1,891	10	3,783	1,892	9
2 Baxenden	2	3,820	1,910	11	3,823	1,912	9
3 Central	2	3,580	1,790	4	3,581	1,791	2
4 Church	2	3,357	1,679	-2	3,358	1,679	-4
5 Clayton North	2	2,943	1,472	-14	3,220	1,610	8
6 Clayton South	2	3,079	1,540	-10	3,357	1,679	-4
7 Huncoat	2	3,316	1,658	-3	3,418	1,709	-2
8 Immanuel	2	3,832	1,916	12	3,848	1,924	10
9 Milnshaw	2	3,578	1,789	4	3,579	1,790	2
10 Netherton	2	3,650	1,825	6	3,655	1,828	4
11 Overton	3	4,647	1,549	-10	4,838	1,613	-8
12 Peel	2	3,461	1,731	1	3,462	1,731	-1
13 Rishton	3	5,135	1,712	0	5,203	1,734	-1
14 St Andrew's	2	3,265	1,633	-5	3,550	1,775	1
15 St Oswald's	3	4,794	1,598	-7	4,801	1,600	-9
16 Spring Hill	2	3,835	1,918	12	3,836	1,918	9
Totals	-	60,074	-	-	61,312	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,716	-	-	1,752	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Hyndburn Conservative Association's submission.

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

Although the Borough Council, the Conservative Association and the Labour Group agreed on the boundary alterations to Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Huncoat, Netherton and Overton, the figures supplied in the three submissions are not the same. The above figures are those which were included in the Conservative's submission.

Hyndburn Labour Party's Proposed Electoral Arrangements

Our draft recommendations detailed in Figures 1 and 2 differ from those put forward by the Labour Group in all but one ward, where the Labour Group's proposals were as follows:

Figure A5: Hyndburn Labour Party's Proposal: Constituent Areas

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas
1	Altham & Clayton	2	Altham ward (part); Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
2	Barnfield	2	Barnfield ward; Baxenden ward (part)
3	Baxenden	2	Baxenden ward (part)
4	Central	2	Central ward
5	Church	2	Church ward (part); Milnshaw ward (part)
6	Clayton-le-Moors	2	Clayton-le-Moors ward (part)
7	Huncoat	2	Altham ward (part); Huncoat ward (part)
8	Immanuel	2	Immanuel ward (part); Spring Hill ward (part)
9	Milnshaw	2	Milnshaw ward (part)
10	Netherton	2	Netherton ward
11	Overton	3	Overton ward
12	Peel	2	Huncoat ward (part); Peel ward (part)
13	St Andrew's	2	Immanuel ward (part); St Andrew's ward (part)
14	St Oswald's	2	St Oswald's ward (part)
15	Spring Hill	2	Spring Hill ward (part)
16	West	2	Church ward (part); St Andrew's ward (part); St Oswald's ward (part)

Figure A6: Hyndburn Labour Party'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 %
1 Altham & Clayton	2	2,458	1,229	-26	3,012	1,506	-12
2 Barnfield	2	3,481	1,741	4	3,481	1,741	2
3 Baxenden	2	3,449	1,725	3	3,451	1,726	1
4 Central	2	3,232	1,616	-3	3,232	1,616	-5
5 Church	2	3,524	1,762	6	3,524	1,762	3
6 Clayton-le-Moors	2	3,589	1,795	8	3,589	1,795	5
7 Huncoat	2	3,304	1,652	-1	3,405	1,703	0
8 Immanuel	2	3,341	1,671	0	3,356	1,678	-1
9 Milnshaw	2	3,493	1,747	5	3,493	1,747	3
10 Netherton	2	3,362	1,681	1	3,366	1,683	-1
11 Overton	3	4,935	1,645	-1	5,125	1,708	0
12 Peel	2	3,380	1,690	1	3,380	1,690	-1
13 Rishton	3	5,135	1,712	3	5,201	1,734	2
14 St Andrew's	2	3,163	1,582	-5	3,447	1,724	1
15 St Oswald's	2	3,279	1,640	-2	3,285	1,643	-4
16 Spring Hill	2	3,708	1,854	11	3,708	1,854	9
17 West	2	3,241	1,621	-3	3,241	1,621	-5
Totals	-	60,074	-	-	61,296	-	-
Averages	-	-	1,669	-	-	1,703	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on Hyndburn Labour Party's submission.

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

Although the Borough Council, the Labour Group and the Conservative Association agreed on the boundary alterations to Altham, Clayton-le-Moors, Huncoat, Netherton and Overton, the figures supplied in the three submissions were not the same. The above figures are those which were included in the Labour Group's submission.

APPENDIX B

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 boroughs 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:

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

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:

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

- the number of councillors;
- the need for parish wards;
- the number and boundaries of any such wards;
- the number of councillors to be elected for any such ward or, in the case of a common parish, for each parish; and
- 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 boroughs:

Having regard to any changes in the number or distribution of the local government electors of the borough 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 borough;
- (b) in a borough every ward of a parish council shall lie wholly within a single ward of the borough;
- (c) in a borough every parish which is not divided into parish wards shall lie wholly within a single ward of the borough.

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.