

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bury

Report to The Electoral Commission

September 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

Report no. 353

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	11
2 Current electoral arrangements	13
3 Draft recommendations	17
4 Responses to consultation	19
5 Analysis and final recommendations	21
6 What happens next?	33
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Bury: detailed mapping	35
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	37
C First draft of the electoral change Order for Bury	39

What is The Boundary Committee for England?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the borough of Bury.

Summary

We began a review of Bury's electoral arrangements on 14 May 2002. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 25 February 2003, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We now submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

- **This report summarises the representations that we received during consultation on our draft recommendations, and contains our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.**

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

- **in five of the 16 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the borough, and three wards vary by more than 20%;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to improve slightly, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in five wards and by more than 20% in one ward.**

Our main final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 97–98) are that:

- **Bury Borough Council should have 51 councillors, three more than at present;**
- **there should be 17 wards, instead of 16 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net increase of one ward.**

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

- **In all of the proposed 17 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 9% from the borough average, both initially and by 2006.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 11 November 2003. The information in the representations will be available for public access once the Order has been made.

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

Fax: 020 7271 0667

**Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose.)**

Table 1: Final recommendations: summary

Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1 Besses	3	Part of Besses ward; part of Pilkington Park ward	3
2 Church	3	Part of Church ward; part of Radcliffe North ward	2
3 East	3	Part of East ward; part of Redvales ward	2
4 Elton	3	Part of Elton ward; part of Ramsbottom ward; part of Tottington ward	1 and 2
5 Holyrood	3	Holyrood ward; part of St Mary's ward	3
6 Moorside	3	Part of East ward; part of Moorside ward	1 and 2
7 North Manor	3	Part of Moorside ward; part of Ramsbottom ward; part of Tottington ward	1 and 2
8 Pilkington Park	3	Part of Pilkington Park ward; part of Radcliffe South ward	3
9 Radcliffe East	3	Part of Radcliffe Central ward; part of Radcliffe North ward; part of Radcliffe South ward	2 and 3
10 Radcliffe North	3	Part of Radcliffe Central ward; part of Radcliffe North ward	2 and 3
11 Radcliffe West	3	Part of Radcliffe Central ward; part of Radcliffe South ward	3
12 Ramsbottom	3	Part of Ramsbottom ward; part of Tottington ward	1
13 Redvales	3	Part of Redvales ward; part of Unsworth ward	2 and 3
14 St Mary's	3	Part of St Mary's ward	3
15 Sedgley	3	Sedgley ward; part of St Mary's ward	3
16 Tottington	3	Part of Church ward; part of Elton ward; part of Tottington ward	1 and 2
17 Unsworth	3	Part of Besses ward; part of Pilkington Park ward; part of Unsworth ward	2 and 3

Notes:

- 1) The whole borough is unparished.
- 2) The wards in the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.
- 3) We have made a number of minor boundary amendments in order to tie existing boundaries to ground detail. These changes do not affect any electors.

Table 2: Final recommendations for Bury

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Besses	3	7,779	2,593	-5	7,932	2,644	-4
2 Church	3	8,767	2,922	7	8,708	2,903	5
3 East	3	7,750	2,583	-6	8,013	2,671	-3
4 Elton	3	8,330	2,777	1	8,270	2,757	0
5 Holyrood	3	8,770	2,923	7	8,616	2,872	4
6 Moorside	3	8,879	2,960	8	8,801	2,934	6
7 North Manor	3	8,266	2,755	0	8,132	2,711	-2
8 Pilkington Park	3	7,993	2,664	-3	8,101	2,700	-2
9 Radcliffe East	3	8,629	2,876	5	8,720	2,907	5
10 Radcliffe North	3	8,902	2,967	8	8,773	2,924	6
11 Radcliffe West	3	7,468	2,489	-9	7,756	2,585	-6
12 Ramsbottom	3	8,536	2,845	4	8,663	2,888	5
13 Redvales	3	8,007	2,669	-3	8,230	2,743	-1
14 St Mary's	3	8,051	2,684	-2	8,166	2,722	-1
15 Sedgley	3	8,702	2,901	6	8,597	2,866	4
16 Tottington	3	7,602	2,534	-8	7,725	2,575	-7
17 Unsworth	3	7,500	2,500	-9	7,493	2,498	-9
Totals	51	139,931	-	-	140,697	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,744	-	-	2,759	-

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

1 Introduction

1 This report contains our final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the borough of Bury. We are reviewing the 10 metropolitan boroughs in Greater Manchester as part of our programme of periodic electoral reviews (PERs) of all 386 principal local authority areas in England. The programme started in 1996 and is currently expected to finish in 2004.

2 This is our first review of the electoral arrangements of Bury. Bury's last review was undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in January 1978 (Report No. 277).

3 In making final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have had regard to:

- the statutory criteria contained in section 13(5) of the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692), i.e. the need to:
 - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - achieve equality of representation;
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972;
- the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relations Act 1996 and the statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality (Commission for Racial Equality, May 2002), i.e. to have due regard to:
 - eliminate unlawful racial discrimination;
 - promote equality of opportunity; and
 - promote good relations between people of different racial groups.

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

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards.

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

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

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit to the number of councillors that can be returned from each metropolitan borough ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan borough wards currently return three councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number

of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could lead to an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 14 May 2002, when we wrote to Bury Metropolitan Borough Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified the Greater Manchester Police Authority, the Local Government Association, the National Association of Local Councils, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the borough, 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 Bury Borough Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 16 September 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 25 February 2003 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bury*, and ended on 22 April 2003. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 Current electoral arrangements

11 The Metropolitan Borough of Bury is situated in the north of Greater Manchester and is bounded by Bolton, Salford, Manchester and Rochdale to the west, south, south-east and east respectively, and by Lancashire and Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council to the north and north-west respectively. The borough lies broadly in the valley of the River Irwell and includes the areas of Bury, Prestwich, Radcliffe, Ramsbottom, Tottington and Whitefield, together with a more rural hinterland. The borough is the northern railhead of the Metrolink and the M60 and M66 motorways run through it.

12 The electorate of the borough is 139,931 (December 2001). The Council presently has 48 members who are elected from 16 wards, the majority of which are relatively urban, although Ramsbottom, Tottington and Moorside wards in the north of the borough contain more rural areas. All wards are three-member wards. The borough is unparished.

13 At present, each councillor represents an average of 2,915 electors, which the Borough Council forecasts will increase to 2,931 by the year 2006 if the present number of councillors is maintained. However, due to demographic and other changes over the past two decades, the number of electors per councillor in five of the 16 wards varies by more than 10% from the borough average and in three wards by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in Ramsbottom ward, where each of the councillors represents 28% more electors than the borough average.

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

Map 1: Existing wards in Bury

Table 3: Existing electoral arrangements

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1 Besses	3	6,941	2,314	-21	6,999	2,333	-20
2 Church	3	8,938	2,979	2	8,876	2,959	1
3 East	3	7,608	2,536	-13	7,793	2,598	-11
4 Elton	3	9,239	3,080	6	9,189	3,063	4
5 Holyrood	3	8,214	2,738	-6	8,068	2,689	-8
6 Moorside	3	8,321	2,774	-5	8,229	2,743	-6
7 Pilkington Park	3	7,910	2,637	-10	8,131	2,710	-8
8 Radcliffe Central	3	8,804	2,935	1	8,916	2,972	1
9 Radcliffe North	3	10,691	3,564	22	10,534	3,511	20
10 Radcliffe South	3	8,196	2,732	-6	8,443	2,814	-4
11 Ramsbottom	3	11,175	3,725	28	11,266	3,755	28
12 Redvales	3	8,232	2,744	-6	8,337	2,779	-5
13 St Mary's	3	9,169	3,056	5	9,265	3,088	5
14 Sedgley	3	8,143	2,714	-7	8,048	2,683	-8
15 Tottington	3	10,205	3,402	17	10,258	3,419	17
16 Unsworth	3	8,145	2,715	-7	8,345	2,782	-5
Totals	48	139,931	-	-	140,697	-	-
Averages	-	-	2,915	-	-	2,931	-

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Bury 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 2001, electors in Besses ward were relatively over-represented by 21% while electors in Ramsbottom ward were significantly under-represented by 28%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 Draft recommendations

15 During Stage One, nine representations were received, including borough-wide schemes from the Council (based on a council size of 51, an increase of three) and the Bury North and Bury South Conservative Associations (based on retaining the existing council size of 48). Representations were also received from a community association and six local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bury*.

16 Our draft recommendations were based on the Borough Council's proposals almost in their entirety. However, we proposed two amendments to better reflect the communities. We proposed that:

- Bury Borough Council should be served by 51 councillors, compared with the current 48, representing 17 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified.

Draft recommendation

Bury Borough Council should comprise 51 councillors, serving 17 wards.

17 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in all 17 wards varying by no more than 9% from the borough average, both initially and by 2006.

4 Responses to consultation

18 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 12 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Bury Borough Council.

Bury Borough Council

19 The Borough Council offered its full support for our draft recommendations.

Bury North Conservative Association

20 Bury North Conservative Association (the Conservatives) accepted the increased council size. However, they opposed the new North Manor ward in the north of the borough, proposing two amendments to it, in order to improve community identity.

Other representations

21 A further 10 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local political groups, local organisations, councillors and residents. Councillor Roy Walker, representing Church ward, Councillor William Johnson, representing Tottington ward, and five local residents opposed the increase of three councillors. All argued that this would lead to increased costs for the taxpayer. They further opposed the North Manor ward, on the basis that it linked disparate communities.

22 A local resident proposed amendments to our North Manor ward, in order to unite areas of Holcombe Brook. He supported the creation of the new ward in principle. A local resident of Unsworth proposed an amendment to the boundary between Unsworth and Besses wards, in order to transfer those properties on the old site of Unsworth Cricket Club into Unsworth ward. Finally, a submission was received from a member of the public who used to live in Bury, proposing eight revised ward names.

5 Analysis and final recommendations

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

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

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

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

Electorate forecasts

27 Since 1975 there has been around a 9% increase in the electorate of Bury borough. The Borough Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of 0.5% from 139,931 to 140,697 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Radcliffe South and Pilkington Park wards, although a significant amount is also expected in Unsworth and East wards. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to Unitary development plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Having accepted that this is an inexact science, and having considered the forecast electorates, we stated in our draft recommendations report that we were satisfied that they represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

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

Council size

29 Bury Metropolitan Borough Council presently has 48 members. During Stage One the Borough Council consulted locally on draft schemes based on 48 and 51 councillors. Following this consultation it submitted a scheme based on a council size of 51 members. It included extensive evidence to support this increase, providing details of the Leader and Cabinet style of political management structure that it had piloted since May 1999 and formally adopted in November 2001. It provided details of the varied roles of councillors, the full Council and the

Executive (Leader and Cabinet), in addition to the Scrutiny and Review panels and the regulatory and non-executive committees. The Council also outlined its Area Board structure.

30 The Conservatives proposed retaining the existing council size of 48 members. They stated that 'the present system of 16 wards ... seems to be ideal for the Borough and has been successful over many years'. They also stated that they saw no justification for the increase in costs associated with an additional three councillors. After reviewing the argumentation received from the Conservatives, the Committee was of the opinion that further argumentation and evidence regarding the specifics of how Bury Borough Council operates effectively under the existing council size was required.

31 Accordingly, the Committee requested further evidence to this effect, which the Conservatives provided. They provided a virtually identical factual description of the new political management structure and its variety of panels, committees and functions to that which the Council provided. They concluded that 'in the light of the political management structure now in place 48 councillors is the appropriate size for the Council to operate effective local government'.

32 A local resident did not support the proposed increase in council size, contending that this would only increase costs.

33 After carefully considering all the argumentation and evidence provided, we were of the view that the Borough Council's argumentation provided more thorough, detailed justification for a slight increase of three members, to a council size of 51. We also noted that the Borough Council's 51-member scheme would provide for a better balance of representation within Bury, addressing the notable under-representation in the north of the borough. We therefore proposed a council size of 51 as part of our draft recommendations.

34 During Stage Three the Conservatives accepted our proposed council size of 51. However, we received a number of representations from local councillors and residents opposing the increase in council size. Much of the argumentation was based on an increase in cost, and a potential increase in tax as a result. However, when deciding on council size, factors such as cost and speculation over tax rises are secondary to the implications as to the increased capability of the council itself, and the beneficial effect on the local area. As detailed previously, we were convinced by the argumentation and evidence provided by the Council during Stage One to justify an increase in council size, and we have not received sufficient evidence during Stage Three to justify moving away from our draft recommendations. We therefore intend confirming a council size of 51 as final.

Electoral arrangements

35 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One, and as a consequence of our decision to adopt the Borough Council's proposed council size of 51, we based our draft recommendations on the Borough Council's scheme. We noted that this scheme had been developed following local consultation. We were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation received that it would provide a better balance between achieving good levels of electoral equality and satisfying the other statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One. Given our decision to base our recommendations on a council size of 51, we were only able to give limited consideration to the Conservatives' proposals (based on a council size of 48). However, we did recognise that there were some areas of consensus between the two schemes, notably the use of the M60 motorway and the River Irwell as strong geographical boundaries.

36 During Stage Three we received general support for our draft recommendations from the Council and the Conservatives. However, as detailed previously, we received a number of representations from local councillors and residents opposing the increased council size. As addressed earlier, we do not intend departing from our recommended council size of 51. Many

of the representations argued that this increase of three councillors allowed the creation of North Manor ward, which links disparate communities. Having reconsidered our warding arrangements for the north of the borough, we do not intend significantly modifying our draft recommendations. Although we concede that North Manor ward does link relatively fragmented communities, we are constrained by the requirement to recommend three-member wards and remain of the view that the Borough Council achieved the best balance between our statutory criteria in its Stage One proposal. However, we propose making two minor amendments to our draft recommendations for these wards.

37 Having considered the representation from a former resident of Bury, in which he proposed renaming a number of wards in the borough, we considered that he provided minimal evidence to justify renaming these wards and we therefore have not been convinced that they would provide for a better reflection of the constituent communities.

38 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three. For borough warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- i. Ramsbottom and Tottington wards (pages 23–25)
- ii. Church and Elton wards (pages 25–26)
- iii. East, Moorside and Redvales wards (pages 26–27)
- iv. Radcliffe Central, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe South wards (pages 27–28)
- v. Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards (pages 28–29)
- vi. Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards (pages 29–30)

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

Ramsbottom and Tottington wards

40 The existing wards of Ramsbottom and Tottington are situated in the north of the borough. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements, both wards are notably under-represented, with Ramsbottom and Tottington wards containing 28% and 17% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively, both now and by 2006.

41 At Stage One the Council proposed modifications to the existing Ramsbottom and Tottington wards in order to facilitate the provision of a new ward in this area and improve electoral equality. It proposed a revised Ramsbottom ward, amending the existing ward's southern boundary. The Council contended that its revised boundary would 'separate the town of Ramsbottom from the smaller but distinctive settlements of Summerseat, Holcombe Brook, Greenmount and Hawkshaw'. The Council further proposed that the part of the existing Ramsbottom ward to the south of its revised boundary would form part of a new North Manor ward. The new North Manor ward would also include the northern part of the existing Moorside ward and the northern part of Tottington ward. The Council stated that this ward would contain 'the villages of Walmersley, Summerseat and Nangreaves to the east, Hawkshaw and Holly Mount to the west, together with the expanded village settlements of Greenmount and Holcombe Brook at the centre'.

42 The Council also proposed that the majority of the remainder of Tottington ward should form a revised Tottington ward, together with the eastern part of the existing Elton ward and a small section of the existing Church ward. The Council stated that its revised ward would contain 'the main settlement of Tottington with the smaller villages of Walshaw to the south and Affetside to the west'.

43 Under the Borough Council's Stage One proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Ramsbottom, North Manor and Tottington wards would be 5% above, equal to and 8% below the borough average initially (6% above, 2% below and 7% below by 2006).

44 A local resident proposed that an additional ward should be created in the north of the borough in order to reduce the size of the Ramsbottom and Tottington wards. He proposed that a new ward should 'encompass the areas of Holcombe Village, Holcombe Brook, Summerseat, Rowlands, Gollinrod, Greenmount, Hawkshaw and Affetside', suggesting that this would 'still keep the predominant and distinctive West Pennine Moors (Southern Pennines Landscape Character Area 36) geographical locality definition in a new ward rather than a solution which would mix urban and rural communities'. However, he did not submit any more detailed proposals.

45 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One regarding this area, we noted that, under its proposed council size of 51, the Council proposed creating an additional ward. We also noted that this was supported by a local resident, who proposed a new ward which was broadly similar to the Council's proposed North Manor ward. As outlined earlier, we adopted the Council's proposals in this area as part of our draft recommendations. We were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation put forward that they provide for improved electoral equality while also adequately reflecting local community identities. We acknowledged that the constraint of having to secure a uniform pattern of three-member wards has resulted in the new North Manor ward comprising a number of settlements. However, officers from the Committee having visited the area, we were satisfied that there are sufficient links between them. Furthermore, the proposed North Manor ward unites the Holcombe Brook area within one ward.

46 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Ramsbottom, North Manor and Tottington wards would be the same as under the Council's proposals.

47 During Stage Three we received 10 representations regarding these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. The Conservatives argued that the new North Manor ward is 'very fragmented as a community'. They therefore proposed two alternatives for the Committee to consider. Their preferred option transferred the village of Hawkshaw from North Manor ward into Tottington ward. However, they stated that if the Committee would not accept such an amendment, those properties on the north side of Turton Road should be transferred into Tottington ward, as they are isolated from the remainder of North Manor ward.

48 Councillor Walker, member for Church ward, and five local residents all objected to the new North Manor ward, on the basis that it contains disparate communities and is dissected by a railway line and the river. A local resident offered support for our draft recommendations for the north of the borough. However, he also proposed transferring a number of properties in Holcombe Brook and Holcombe Village from Ramsbottom to North Manor ward, in order to better reflect community identity. He also proposed transferring the area in the east of North Manor ward, encompassing the villages of Walmersley and Nangreaves, to Moorside ward, arguing that these settlements shared little community identity with the remainder of North Manor ward. Finally, a former resident of Bury proposed renaming North Manor ward as Holcombe Brook ward.

49 We have carefully considered all representations received during Stage Three. As detailed previously, having reconsidered our draft recommendations for the new North Manor ward and while we concede that the disparate communities do not necessarily share much affinity, we are constrained by the requirement of recommending three-member wards and remain of the opinion that, in general, our draft recommendations strike the best balance between our statutory criteria, and do not intend significantly departing from them. We do not consider that

the transfer of Hawkshaw, Holcombe Village, Walmersley or Nangreaves, as proposed by a local resident, would improve upon our draft recommendations. Similarly, we do not consider that sufficient evidence was provided as for the renaming of North Manor ward.

50 However, we do intend modifying our draft recommendations for the boundaries of North Manor ward in two areas. Having visited the area, we agree with the Conservatives' assertion that electors in those properties situated on the northern side of Turton Road share more affinity with and better access to Tottington ward. We therefore propose transferring them into Tottington ward. Similarly, having visited the area, we agree that those electors to the north of Bolton Road West and on Redisher Close and Park Road share more affinity with the remainder of Holcombe Brook in North Manor ward, and intend transferring them from Ramsbottom ward into North Manor ward. These amendments have a negligible effect on electoral equality, and we agree that they better reflect community identity. Subject to these two amendments, we are confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

51 Under our final recommendations the electoral variance in North Manor and Tottington wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. The number of electors per councillor in Ramsbottom ward would be 4% above the borough average initially (5% above the borough average by 2006). Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Church and Elton wards

52 The existing wards of Church and Elton are situated broadly in the north of the borough, covering the western part of Bury. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements Church and Elton wards contain 2% and 6% more electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1% and 4% more by 2006).

53 At Stage One the Council proposed revised Elton and Church wards. As detailed earlier, the Council proposed amendments to the existing Elton ward's western and northern boundaries, to provide a better reflection of local communities and more identifiable boundaries. It retained the remainder of the ward's existing boundaries. The Council proposed broadly retaining the existing Church ward except for a minor amendment to its northern boundary, in addition to a minor amendment to its southern boundary.

54 Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church and Elton wards would be 7% and 1% above the borough average initially (5% above and equal to the average by 2006).

55 The Conservatives' proposals in this area had some similarities to the Council's scheme, as they proposed retaining the existing Church ward's southern boundary and retaining the existing eastern boundary to follow the River Irwell.

56 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One regarding this area, we were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation provided that the Council's proposals in this area would provide for a good balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. We noted that there was broad consensus for this warding pattern and that the revised wards would continue to utilise the River Irwell as a boundary. We agreed that this is a very identifiable boundary.

57 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church and Elton wards would be the same as under the Council's proposals.

58 We received two representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. A former resident of Bury proposed renaming Church ward as Walshaw & Ainsworth ward. In the light of the support for and the lack of any opposition to our proposals, we intend confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final. We do not consider that sufficient evidence and argumentation was provided to support the renaming of Church ward, and therefore intend to retain the existing name.

59 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Church and Elton wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

East, Moorside and Redvales wards

60 The existing wards of East, Moorside and Redvales are situated broadly in the north of the borough, covering the eastern part of Bury. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements, East, Moorside and Redvales wards are slightly over-represented, containing 13%, 5% and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (11%, 6% and 5% fewer by 2006).

61 At Stage One the Council proposed revised East, Moorside and Redvales wards. It proposed transferring the northern part of Moorside ward to a new North Manor ward, detailed earlier. The remainder of the existing Moorside ward would be combined with the northwestern part of the existing East ward. The Council acknowledged that the M66 motorway could have been used as a boundary in this area, but contended that its revised Moorside ward would ensure that all of the Bird Estate would be included within one ward.

62 The Council also proposed that the remainder of the existing East ward be combined with the northern part of the existing Redvales ward to form a revised East ward. It also proposed that the remainder of the existing Redvales ward be combined with the northern part of the existing Unsworth ward to form a revised Redvales ward. It contended that the River Roch 'acts as a good natural boundary' as there is only one vehicular crossing point along this stretch of the river (at Blackford Bridge), also contending that to the north the East Lancashire railway 'serves as a good boundary due to the limited number of bridges ... that cross the line'.

63 Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor in the proposed East, Moorside and Redvales wards would be 6% below, 8% above and 3% below the borough average initially (3% below, 6% above and 1% below by 2006).

64 A local resident supported the inclusion of the Orchard Drive area within Redvales ward, contending that they share more geographical and community links with other properties off Gigg Lane (in Redvales ward) than with Unsworth ward.

65 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One regarding this area, we were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation provided that the Council's proposals would provide for the best balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. We noted that the revised wards would continue to utilise the River Irwell as a boundary, along with the Rochdale Old Road, East Lancashire railway and the River Roch. We agreed that these are all identifiable boundaries which would facilitate the provision of effective and convenient local government. We also noted the Council's justification for breaching the M66 motorway in order to unite the Bird Estate within the proposed Moorside ward. We agreed that this would better reflect local community identity and therefore adopted the Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. However, we proposed one minor amendment to the boundary between the proposed East and Redvales wards so that all of St Gabriel's RC High School was united within Redvales ward. This amendment did not affect any electors.

66 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed East, Moorside and Redvales wards would be the same as under the Council's proposals.

67 We received three representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. As detailed previously, a local resident proposed that the villages of Nangreaves and Walmersley be transferred from North Manor ward into Moorside ward. However, as stated, we do not consider that there was sufficient argumentation provided to justify transferring these areas into Moorside ward. A former resident of Bury stated that he did not consider the ward names for these wards to be 'particularly relevant', but offered no alternatives. We therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

68 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in East, Moorside and Redvales wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

Radcliffe Central, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe South wards

69 The existing wards of Radcliffe Central, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe South are situated in the west of the borough. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements Radcliffe Central, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe South wards contain 1% more, 22% more and 6% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (1% more, 20% more and 4% fewer by 2006).

70 At Stage One the Council proposed a new Radcliffe East ward, comprising part of the existing Radcliffe North ward, part of the existing Radcliffe Central ward and part of the existing Radcliffe South ward. The Council also proposed a revised Radcliffe North ward comprising the remainder of the existing Radcliffe North ward, together with part of the existing Radcliffe Central ward. It further proposed a new Radcliffe West ward comprising the remainder of the existing Radcliffe Central ward together with a large part of the existing Radcliffe South ward. The Council also proposed a minor amendment to the existing southern boundary of Radcliffe South ward, so that the new Radcliffe West ward's southern boundary would follow a longer section of the centre of Ringley Road West.

71 Under the Council's proposals the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Radcliffe East, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe West wards would be 3% above, 10% above and 9% below the borough average initially (3% above, 8% above and 6% below by 2006).

72 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One regarding this area, we based our draft recommendations on the Council's proposals, as we were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation received that they would secure the best balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. However, we proposed a boundary amendment so that all the properties on the western side of Starling Road, and those properties which are accessed via the western side of Starling Road (including those on Bury and Bolton Roads), are included within Radcliffe East ward. We were of the view that this amendment would provide for a better reflection of local communities.

73 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Radcliffe East, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe West wards would be 5% above, 8% above and 9% below the borough average initially (5% above, 6% above and 6% below by 2006).

74 We received only one representation in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

75 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Radcliffe East, Radcliffe North and Radcliffe West wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards

76 The existing wards of Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth are situated broadly in the centre of the borough. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards are over-represented, containing 21%, 10% and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (20%, 8% and 5% fewer by 2006).

77 At Stage One the Council proposed revised Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards. Its revised Unsworth ward would comprise an area of the existing Unsworth ward together with the north-east part of the existing Pilkington Park ward, in addition to the area broadly to the east of Pole Lane and the M66, and to the north of the M62, from the existing Besses ward. Furthermore, the Council contended that its revised eastern boundary 'places the rural areas to the east of the M66 within a single ward', in addition to ensuring that 'Unsworth Cricket Club, a focal point for the community, is located within Unsworth ward'.

78 The Council proposed a revised Besses ward, comprising the remainder of the existing Besses ward together with two areas from the existing Pilkington Park ward. The Council stated that Bury New Road was a 'significant physical barrier' in this area as it has 'up to six traffic lanes and few pedestrian crossing points'. The Council's revised Pilkington Park ward would comprise the remainder of the existing Pilkington Park ward together with the eastern part of the existing Radcliffe South ward. The Council contended that the M60 motorway 'provides a strong physical barrier which acts as an appropriate and logical boundary line' in this area.

79 Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards would be 5%, 3% and 9% below the borough average initially (4%, 2% and 9% below by 2006).

80 The Conservatives also proposed retaining the M60 motorway as a boundary in this area. Hollins Village Community Association proposed that the Hollins Village name 'should be recognised' and that Hollins should be known as a ward in its own right. It also proposed that the area should be included in the Bury South parliamentary constituency. A local resident opposed the retention of Parr Lane as the boundary between Unsworth and Besses wards, contending that this splits 'what is an autonomous area of Unsworth'.

81 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One regarding this area, we were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation provided that the Council's proposals in this area would provide for the best balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals as part of our draft recommendations. We noted that the M60 and M62 motorways would continue to form the southern boundaries of the revised Pilkington Park and Besses wards and agreed that these are strong and identifiable boundaries. We were also persuaded that the River Roch, the M66 and the Bury New Road (A56) also provide identifiable boundaries. We noted the local resident's comments regarding the use of Parr Lane as a boundary. However, we were not persuaded to move away from the Council's proposals in this area.

82 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards would be the same as under the Council's proposals.

83 During Stage Three, we received three representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. A local resident of Unsworth argued that those properties immediately to the west of Unsworth Cricket Club, on Pole Lane, Kennedy Drive, Bradley Drive and Harris Drive, be transferred from Besses ward into Unsworth ward. He stated that this area was the former site of Unsworth Cricket Club. He also included a 55-signature petition to this effect. A former resident of Bury proposed renaming Pilkington Park ward as Whitefield ward.

84 Having considered those representations received during Stage Three, we are content to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. We note the proposal to transfer a number of properties from Besses ward into Unsworth ward. However, we have not been convinced by the argument provided that this would strike a better balance between our statutory criteria than our draft recommendations, as insufficient evidence was provided as to how these properties share more affinity with Unsworth. We also note that the boundary suggested was indistinct and divided properties on the same road. As detailed previously, we do not consider that sufficient evidence or local support exists for the renaming of Pilkington ward. We therefore propose confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

85 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Besses, Pilkington Park and Unsworth wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards

86 The existing wards of Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley are situated in the far south of the borough, to the south of the M62 motorway. Each ward is represented by three councillors. Under the current arrangements Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards contain 6% fewer, 5% more and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the borough average respectively (8% fewer, 5% more and 8% fewer by 2006).

87 At Stage One the Council proposed two boundary amendments in this area. It proposed amending the boundary between St Mary's and Holyrood wards to follow the Metrolink line until it reached the existing boundary at the junction of Heys Road and Fairfax Road. It also proposed amending the boundary between St Mary's and Sedgley wards so that it followed the centre of Hilton Lane before following the eastern perimeter of Prestwich Golf Club to the borough boundary.

88 Under the Council's proposals, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards would be 7% above, 2% below and 6% above the borough average initially (4% above, 1% below and 4% above by 2006).

89 The Conservatives also proposed utilising the Metrolink line as a boundary between St Mary's and Holyrood ward, but proposed retaining the existing boundary between St Mary's and Sedgley wards. They also proposed retaining the M60 motorway as a boundary in this area.

90 A local resident proposed that the River Irwell and M60 motorway be retained as boundaries as there are limited crossing points. He also proposed that the three wards to the south of the M60 (St Mary's, Sedgley and Holyrood) remain unchanged, although suggested that Holyrood ward be renamed St Margaret's 'after the main church in the area, and because it forms a pattern with St Mary's [ward]'. A local resident proposed minor amendments to the boundaries between St Mary's, Sedgley and Holyrood wards to secure a better balance of representation. His revised boundary between St Mary's and Sedgley wards was the same as under the Council's scheme. However, he proposed that the boundary between St Mary's and Holyrood wards should follow the centre of Nursery Road rather than the Metrolink. He also suggested that St Mary's ward should be renamed Prestwich West to better reflect the identity of that area.

91 A local resident broadly supported the Council's proposals in the Prestwich area, but did not believe that the Metrolink was a natural boundary, proposing that Nursery Road be used as a boundary between Holyrood and St Mary's wards. He also proposed retaining the existing ward names in that area.

92 Having carefully considered the representations received during Stage One, we were persuaded by the evidence and argumentation provided that the Council's proposals in this area would provide for a better balance between electoral equality and the other statutory criteria. These proposals have also received a degree of local support. We therefore adopted the Council's proposals in this area as part of our draft recommendations.

93 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards would be the same as under the Council's proposals.

94 During Stage Three, we received two representations in response to our draft recommendations for these wards. The Borough Council offered full support for our draft recommendations. A former resident of Bury proposed renaming Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards as Higher Prestwich (or Prestwich North), Prestwich West and Prestwich East wards, respectively. However, we do not consider that he provided sufficient evidence to justify these ward name changes, nor do we consider that there is sufficient evidence of local support. We therefore intend confirming our draft recommendations for these wards as final.

95 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Holyrood, St Mary's and Sedgley wards would be the same as under our draft recommendations. Our final recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Electoral cycle

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

Conclusions

97 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse our draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments:

- we propose amending the boundary between North Manor and Ramsbottom wards in order to better reflect the community;
- we propose amending the boundary between North Manor and Tottington wards in order to better reflect the community.

98 We conclude that, in Bury:

- there should be an increase in council size from 48 to 51;
- there should be 17 wards, one more than at present;
- the boundaries of all of the existing wards should be modified.

99 Table 4 shows the impact of our final recommendations on electoral equality, comparing them with the current arrangements, based on 2001 and 2006 electorate figures.

Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	48	51	48	51
Number of wards	16	17	16	17
Average number of electors per councillor	2,915	2,744	2,931	2,759
Number of wards with a variance of more than 10% from the average	5	0	5	0
Number of wards with a variance of more than 20% from the average	3	0	1	0

100 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from five to none, both initially and by 2006.

Final recommendation

Bury Borough Council should comprise 51 councillors serving 17 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and in Appendix A and the large maps.

Map 2: Final recommendations for Bury

6 What happens next?

101 Having completed our review of electoral arrangements in Bury and submitted our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission, we have fulfilled our statutory obligation under the Local Government Act 1992 (as amended by SI 2001 No. 3692).

102 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 11 November 2003, and The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by that date. They particularly welcome any comments on the first draft of the Order, which will implement the new arrangements.

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

**The Secretary
The Electoral Commission
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London SW1P 2HW**

**Fax: 020 7271 0667
Email: implementation@electoralcommission.org.uk
(This address should only be used for this purpose.)**

Appendix A

Final recommendations for Bury: detailed mapping

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

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

The **large maps** illustrate the proposed warding arrangements for Bury.

Map A1: Final recommendations for Bury: Key map

Appendix B

Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order

Preamble

This describes the process by which the Statutory Instrument will be made, and under which powers. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decides not to modify the Final Recommendations.

Citation and commencement

This defines the name of the Statutory Instrument and sets the dates on which it will come into force.

Interpretation

This defines terms that are used in the Statutory Instrument.

Wards of the Borough of Bury

This abolishes the existing wards, and defines the names and areas of the new wards, in conjunction with the map and the Schedule.

Elections of the council of the Borough of Bury

This sets the date on which a whole council election will be held to implement the new wards, and the dates on which councillors will retire.

Maps

This requires Bury Borough Council to make a print of the map available for public inspection.

Electoral registers

This requires Bury Borough Council to adapt the electoral register to reflect the new wards.

Revocation

This revokes the Statutory Instrument that defines the existing wards, with the exception of any articles that established the system of election by thirds.

Explanatory note

This explains the purpose of each article. Text in square brackets will be removed if The Electoral Commission decides not to modify the Final Recommendations.

Appendix C

First draft of the electoral change Order for Bury

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2003 No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The Borough of Bury (Electoral Changes) Order 2003

Made - - - - 2003

Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)

Whereas the Boundary Committee for England(a), acting pursuant to section 15(4) of the Local Government Act 1992(b), has submitted to the Electoral Commission(c) recommendations dated September 2003 on its review of the borough(d) of Bury:

And whereas the Electoral Commission have decided to give effect [with modifications] to those recommendations:

And whereas a period of not less than six weeks has expired since the receipt of those recommendations:

Now, therefore, the Electoral Commission, in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sections 17(e) and 26(f) of the Local Government Act 1992, and of all other powers enabling them in that behalf, hereby make the following Order:

Citation and commencement

- 1.—(1) This Order may be cited as the Borough of Bury (Electoral Changes) Order 2003.
- (2) This Order shall come into force –

-
- (a) The Boundary Committee for England is a committee of the Electoral Commission, established by the Electoral Commission in accordance with section 14 of the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c.41). The Local Government Commission for England (Transfer of Functions) Order 2001 (S.I. 2001/3962) transferred to the Electoral Commission the functions of the Local Government Commission for England.
- (b) 1992 c.19. This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.
- (c) The Electoral Commission was established by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2000 (c.41). The functions of the Secretary of State, under sections 13 to 15 and 17 of the Local Government Act 1992 (c.19), to the extent that they relate to electoral changes within the meaning of that Act, were transferred with modifications to the Electoral Commission on 1st April 2002 (S.I. 2001/3962).
- (d) The metropolitan district of Bury has the status of a borough.
- (e) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962 and also otherwise in ways not relevant to this Order.
- (f) This section has been amended by S.I. 2001/3962.

- (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to any election to be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004, on the day after that on which it is made;
- (b) for all other purposes, on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Interpretation

2. In this Order –

“borough” means the borough of Bury;

“existing”, in relation to a ward, means the ward as it exists on the date this Order is made; and

any reference to the map is a reference to the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Bury (Electoral Changes) Order 2003”, of which prints are available for inspection at –

- (a) the principal office of the Electoral Commission; and
- (b) the offices of Bury Borough Council.

Wards of the borough of Bury

3.—(1) The existing wards of the borough(a) shall be abolished.

(2) The borough shall be divided into seventeen wards which shall bear the names set out in the Schedule.

(3) Each ward shall comprise the area designated on the map by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by red lines; and the number of councillors to be elected for each ward shall be three.

(4) Where a boundary is shown on the map as running along a road, railway line, footway, watercourse or similar geographical feature, it shall be treated as running along the centre line of the feature.

Elections of the council of the borough of Bury

4.—(1) Elections of all councillors for all wards of the borough shall be held simultaneously on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004(b)(c).

(2) The councillors holding office for any ward of the borough immediately before the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004 shall retire on that date and the newly elected councillors for those wards shall come into office on that date.

(3) Of the councillors elected in 2004 one shall retire in 2006, one in 2007 and one in 2008.

(4) Of the councillors elected in 2004 –

- (a) the first to retire shall, subject to paragraphs (6) and (7), be the councillor elected by the smallest number of votes; and
- (b) the second to retire shall, subject to those paragraphs, be the councillor elected by the next smallest number of votes.

(5) In the case of an equality of votes between any persons elected which makes it uncertain which of them is to retire in any year, the person to retire in that year shall be determined by lot.

(6) If an election of councillors for any ward is not contested, the person to retire in each year shall be determined by lot.

(a) See the Borough of Bury (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1978 (S.I 1978/1722).

(b) Article 4 provides for a single election of all the councillors and for reversion to the system of election by thirds, as established by section 7 of the Local Government Act 1972 (c.70).

(c) For the ordinary day of election of councillors of local government areas, see section 37 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2), amended by section 18(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1985 (c.50) and section 17 of, and paragraphs 1 and 5 of Schedule 3 to, the Greater London Authority Act 1999 (c.29).

(7) Where under this article any question is to be determined by lot, the lot shall be drawn at the next practicable meeting of the council after the question has arisen and the drawing shall be conducted under the direction of the person presiding at the meeting.

Maps

5. Bury Borough Council shall make a print of the map marked “Map referred to in the Borough of Bury (Electoral Changes) Order 2003” available for inspection at its offices by any member of the public at any reasonable time.

Electoral registers

6. The Electoral Registration Officer(a) for the borough shall make such rearrangement of, or adaptation of, the register of local government electors as may be necessary for the purposes of, and in consequence of, this Order.

Revocation

7. The Borough of Bury (Electoral Changes) Order 1978 (b) is revoked, save for articles 8 and 9 (7).

Sealed with the seal of the Electoral Commission on the day of 2003

Chairman of the Commission

Secretary to the Commission

(a) As to electoral registration officers and the register of local government electors, *see* sections 8 to 13 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2).
(b) S.I. 1978/1722.

SCHEDULE

article 3

NAMES OF WARDS

Besses	Radcliffe North
Church	Radcliffe West
East	Ramsbottom
Elton	Redvales
Holyrood	St Mary's
Moorside	Sedgley
North Manor	Tottington
Pilkington Park	Unsworth
Radcliffe East	

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Order)

This Order gives effect, [with modifications], to recommendations by the Boundary Committee for England, a committee of the Electoral Commission, for electoral changes in the borough of Bury.

The modifications are *indicate the modifications*.

The changes have effect in relation to local government elections to be held on and after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the borough and provides for the creation of seventeen new wards. That article and the Schedule also make provision for the names and areas of, and numbers of councillors for, the new wards.

Article 4 makes provision for a whole council election in 2004 and for reversion to the established system of election by thirds in subsequent years.

Article 6 obliges the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary amendments to the electoral register to reflect the new electoral arrangements.

Article 7 revokes the Borough of Bury (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1978, with the exception of articles 8 and 9 (7).

The areas of the new borough wards are demarcated on the map described in article 2. Prints of the map may be inspected at all reasonable times at the offices of Bury Borough Council and at the principal office of the Electoral Commission at Trevelyan House, Great Peter Street, London SW1P 2HW.