

Draft recommendations on the  
future electoral arrangements for  
Liverpool City

*September 2002*

© Crown Copyright 2002

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. 326

# CONTENTS

	page
WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?	5
SUMMARY	7
1 INTRODUCTION	13
2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS	15
3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED	19
4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS	21
5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	47
APPENDICES	
A Draft recommendations for Liverpool City: Detailed mapping	49
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	51



# WHAT IS THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE FOR ENGLAND?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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



## SUMMARY

The Local Government Commission for England (LGCE) began a review of the electoral arrangements for Liverpool City on 4 December 2001. As a consequence of the transfer of functions referred to earlier, it falls to us to complete the work of the LGCE.

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

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

- **in 20 of the 33 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the city and 11 wards vary by more than 20% from the average;**
- **by 2006 this situation is expected to worsen, with the number of electors per councillor forecast to vary by more than 10% from the average in 22 wards and by more than 20% in 13 wards.**

Our main draft recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 170-171) are that:

- **Liverpool City Council should have 90 councillors, nine fewer than at present;**
- **there should be 30 wards, instead of 33 as at present;**
- **the boundaries of 33 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three, and no ward should retain its existing boundaries.**

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

- **In only two of the proposed 30 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by more than 10% from the city average.**
- **An improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue with the number of electors per councillor in all wards expected to vary by no more than 10% from the average for the city in 2006.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 3 September 2002. We take this consultation very seriously. We may decide to move away from our draft recommendations in the light of comments or suggestions that we receive. It is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, *whether or not* they agree with our draft recommendations.**
- **After considering local views, we will decide whether to modify our draft recommendations. We will then submit our final recommendations to The Electoral Commission which will be responsible for implementing change to local authority electoral arrangements.**

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

You should express your views by writing directly to us at the address below by 28 October 2002:

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

Table 1: Draft recommendations: summary

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Large Map Reference</b>
1	Anfield	3	part of Anfield ward; part of Breckfield ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1
2	Belle Vale	3	Netherley ward; part of Childwall ward and part of Valley ward	3
3	Central	3	part of Abercromby ward; part of Everton ward and part of Smithdown ward	1 and 2
4	Childwall	3	part of Childwall ward and part of Valley ward	3
5	Church	3	part of Allerton ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Grassendale ward	2 and 3
6	Clubmoor	3	part of Clubmoor ward; part of County ward; part of Pirrie ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1
7	County	3	part of County ward; part of Melrose ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
8	Cressington	3	part of Allerton ward; part of Grassendale ward and part of St Mary's ward	2 and 3
9	Croxteth	3	part of Croxteth ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1
10	Everton	3	part of Breckfield ward; part of Everton ward; part of Kensington ward and part of Vauxhall ward	1
11	Fazakerley	3	part of Gillmoss ward; part of Fazakerley ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
12	Greenbank	3	part of Aigburth ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Picton ward	2
13	Hunts Cross	3	part of Allerton ward and part of Woolton ward	3
14	Kensington & Fairfield	3	part of Kensington ward; part of Smithdown ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1 and 2
15	Kirkdale	3	part of Everton ward; part of Melrose ward and part of Vauxhall ward	1
16	Knotty Ash	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Childwall ward; part of Croxteth ward and part of Dovecot ward	1 and 3
17	Norris Green	3	part of Clubmoor ward; part of Gillmoss ward; part of Fazakerley ward and part of Pirrie ward	1
18	Old Swan	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Kensington ward and part of Old Swan ward	1, 2 and 3
19	Otterspool	3	part of Aigburth ward and part of Grassendale ward	2 and 3
20	Picton	3	part of Kensington ward; part of Picton ward and part of Smithdown ward	2
21	Princes Park	3	part of Granby ward	2
22	Riverside	3	part of Abercromby ward and part of Dingle ward	2
23	St Michael's	3	part of Aigburth ward; part of Arundel ward and part of Dingle ward	2
24	Speke-Garston	3	Speke ward and part of St Mary's ward	3
25	Tuebrook & Stoneyford	3	part of Anfield ward; part of Clubmoor ward; part of Croxteth ward; part of Old Swan ward and part of Tuebrook ward	1

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Constituent areas</b>	<b>Large Map Reference</b>
26	Warbreck	3	part of County ward; part of Pirrie ward and part of Warbreck ward	1
27	Wavertree	3	Church ward; part of Childwall ward and part of Picton ward	2 and 3
28	West Derby	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Croxteth ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1
29	Woolton	3	part of Arundel ward; part of Childwall ward and part of Woolton ward	3
30	Yew Tree	3	part of Broadgreen ward; part of Croxteth ward; part of Dovecot ward and part of Gillmoss ward	1

*Notes: 1 The whole district is unparished.*

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

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

Table 2: Draft recommendations for Liverpool City

	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	Anfield	3	12,105	4,035	7	11,374	3,791	1
2	Belle Vale	3	11,586	3,862	2	11,294	3,765	0
3	Central	3	9,245	3,082	-19	11,513	3,838	2
4	Childwall	3	11,403	3,801	0	11,409	3,803	1
5	Church	3	11,316	3,772	0	11,309	3,770	0
6	Clubmoor	3	11,700	3,900	3	11,332	3,777	0
7	County	3	11,455	3,818	1	10,914	3,638	-3
8	Cressington	3	11,404	3,801	0	11,272	3,757	0
9	Croxteth	3	10,693	3,564	-6	11,242	3,747	0
10	Everton	3	11,899	3,966	5	11,681	3,894	3
11	Fazakerley	3	11,599	3,866	2	11,184	3,728	-1
12	Greenbank	3	11,571	3,857	2	11,693	3,898	3
13	Hunts Cross	3	10,902	3,634	-4	10,918	3,639	-3
14	Kensington & Fairfield	3	11,635	3,878	3	11,159	3,720	-1
15	Kirkdale	3	12,021	4,007	6	11,617	3,872	3
16	Knotty Ash	3	10,768	3,589	-5	10,808	3,603	-4
17	Norris Green	3	11,955	3,985	5	11,413	3,804	1
18	Old Swan	3	11,807	3,936	4	11,550	3,850	2
19	Otterspool	3	10,590	3,530	-7	10,734	3,578	-5
20	Picton	3	12,337	4,112	9	11,411	3,804	1
21	Princes Park	3	11,707	3,902	3	11,722	3,907	4
22	Riverside	3	9,590	3,197	-16	11,401	3,800	1
23	St Michael's	3	10,942	3,647	-4	11,142	3,714	-1
24	Speke-Garston	3	12,463	4,154	10	11,815	3,938	5
25	Tuebrook & Stoneyford	3	12,166	4,055	7	11,513	3,838	2
26	Warbreck	3	11,087	3,696	-2	10,848	3,616	-4
27	Wavertree	3	11,210	3,737	-1	10,998	3,666	-3
28	West Derby	3	11,409	3,803	1	11,600	3,867	3

Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
29 Woolton	3	10,950	3,650	-4	11,089	3,696	-2
30 Yew Tree	3	10,966	3,655	-3	10,973	3,658	-3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>340,481</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>338,928</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,783</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,766</b>	<b>-</b>

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

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

# 1 INTRODUCTION

1 This report contains our proposals for the electoral arrangements for the city of Liverpool, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the five metropolitan boroughs in Merseyside 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 Liverpool. Liverpool's last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in 1979 (Report no. 319).

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

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

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Liverpool City was conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Local Authorities and Other Interested Parties* (LGCE, fifth edition published in October 2001). This *Guidance* sets out the approach to the review.

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

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

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, nor that changes should be made to the size of a council simply to make it more consistent with the size of other similar councils.

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit on the number of councillors which can be returned from each metropolitan city ward. However, the figure

must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan city wards currently return three councillors. Where our recommendation is for multi-member wards, we believe that the number of councillors to be returned from each ward should not exceed three, other than in very exceptional circumstances. Numbers in excess of three could result in an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

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

*Table 3: Stages of the review*

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

10 Stage One began on 4 December 2001, when the LGCE wrote to Liverpool City Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. It also notified Merseyside Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Lancashire Association of Town & Parish Councils, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the city, Members of the European Parliament for the North West Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. It placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Liverpool City Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 25 March 2002.

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

12 We are currently at Stage Three. This stage, which began on 3 September 2002 and will end on 28 October 2002, involves publishing the draft proposals in this report and public consultation on them. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.**

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

## 2 CURRENT ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS

14 The city of Liverpool is a metropolitan authority covering 11,276 hectares with a population of 468,000. It has a diverse mixture of industry and commerce within the city's boundaries and is famous as one of the world's most important ports. The great wealth earned by the city's merchants and shipowners is reflected in many fine buildings across the city including the Royal Liver building, St George's Hall and the Liverpool museum. The city's two cathedrals are also excellent architectural examples. Liverpool also boasts a significant musical heritage with groups such as the Beatles. The city has excellent communications; two Mersey Tunnels, motorway and rail links with London and other principal cities and a major airport at Speke within the city area.

15 The electorate of the city is 340,481 (December 2001). The City Council presently has 99 members who are elected from 33 wards, all of which are urban. All wards are three-member wards and the area is completely unparished.

16 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,439 electors, which the City Council forecasts will decrease to 3,424 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 20 of the 33 wards varies by more than 10% from the city average, 11 wards by more than 20% and eight wards by more than 30%. The worst imbalance is in Vauxhall ward where each councillor represents 48% fewer electors than the city average.

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

*Map 1: Existing wards in Liverpool City*

Table 4: 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	Abercromby	3	10,834	3,611	5	12,736	4,245	24
2	Aigburth	3	13,847	4,616	34	14,157	4,719	38
3	Allerton	3	12,136	4,045	18	12,248	4,083	19
4	Anfield	3	10,769	3,590	4	10,127	3,376	-1
5	Arundel	3	11,080	3,693	7	10,823	3,608	5
6	Breckfield	3	8,456	2,819	-18	7,983	2,661	-22
7	Broadgreen	3	11,475	3,825	11	11,330	3,777	10
8	Childwall	3	13,045	4,348	26	13,032	4,344	27
9	Church	3	14,942	4,981	45	14,883	4,961	45
10	Clubmoor	3	9,325	3,108	-10	8,994	2,998	-12
11	County	3	10,939	3,646	6	10,592	3,531	3
12	Croxteth	3	13,312	4,437	29	13,516	4,505	32
13	Dingle	3	9,989	3,330	-3	10,418	3,473	1
14	Dovecot	3	9,522	3,174	-8	9,633	3,211	-6
15	Everton	3	6,674	2,225	-35	8,860	2,953	-14
16	Fazakerley	3	10,902	3,634	6	10,475	3,492	2
17	Gillmoss	3	13,689	4,563	33	14,152	4,717	38
18	Granby	3	8,222	2,741	-20	8,065	2,688	-21
19	Grassendale	3	11,952	3,984	16	12,134	4,045	18
20	Kensington	3	10,271	3,424	0	9,915	3,305	-3
21	Melrose	3	9,675	3,225	-6	8,951	2,984	-13
22	Netherley	3	5,706	1,902	-45	5,532	1,844	-46
23	Old Swan	3	9,902	3,301	-4	9,692	3,231	-6
24	Picton	3	11,098	3,699	8	10,352	3,451	1
25	Pirrie	3	9,179	3,060	-11	8,779	2,926	-15
26	Smithdown	3	8,531	2,844	-17	8,255	2,752	-20
27	Speke	3	6,161	2,054	-40	5,719	1,906	-44
28	St Mary's	3	8,954	2,985	-13	8,436	2,812	-18
29	Tuebrook	3	11,340	3,780	10	10,689	3,563	4
30	Valley	3	7,185	2,395	-30	7,055	2,352	-31

	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 %
31	Vauxhall	3	5,374	1,791	-48	5,578	1,859	-46
32	Warbreck	3	13,849	4,616	34	13,531	4,510	32
33	Woolton	3	12,146	4,049	18	12,286	4,095	20
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>340,481</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>338,928</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
	<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,439</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,424</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Liverpool City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor varies from the average for the city. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Church ward were relatively under-represented by 45%, while electors in Vauxhall ward were relatively over-represented by 48%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

### 3 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

18 At the start of the review members of the public and other interested parties were invited to write to the LGCE giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Liverpool City Council.

19 During this initial stage of the review, officers from the LGCE visited the area and met officers and members from the City Council. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. The LGCE received 426 representations during Stage One, including three city-wide schemes from Liverpool City Council, the Labour Group and Councillors Marbrow and Firth, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council.

#### **Liverpool City Council**

20 The City Council proposed a council of 90 members, nine fewer than at present, serving 30 wards, compared to the existing 33. A council of 90 members was recommended by the Council's Governance Review Group and confirmed by its Electoral Review Group. The City Council produced several maps during Stage One, as indicated in the city-wide submissions below, before basing its scheme on Map C5 which was passed by a council majority.

21 The Council stated that it placed particular emphasis on securing excellent levels of electoral equality, using clear and recognisable topographical features for ward boundaries and respecting community ties when drawing up its submission. The City Council's scheme improved electoral equality with no ward varying by more than 5% from the city average in 2006.

#### **The Labour Group**

22 The Labour Group proposed a city-wide scheme based on Map C6, which was an earlier City Council scheme produced for internal consultation. This scheme consisted of a 90-member council representing 30 wards. The Labour Group supported the City Council's proposal for a 90-member council and added two additional points. The Labour Group cited the need to retain a high number of councillors to maintain effective scrutiny to ensure good governance and also to allow councillors to effectively carry out the community champion role.

23 The Labour Group cited areas of agreement with the City Council scheme, these being council size and population forecast methodology, before providing an alternative warding pattern to that of the Council as it felt the need to draw up their own proposals as the main opposition on Liverpool City Council. The city-wide scheme was similar to the City Council's scheme in the northeast and eastern areas but provided for a substantially different warding pattern in the remainder of the city, in particular the southern area of the city by grouping the Speke and Garston areas in a single ward. The Labour Group's scheme improved electoral equality with no ward varying by more than 5% from the city average in 2006.

#### **Councillors Marbrow and Firth**

24 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed a city-wide scheme based on Map C4, which was an earlier City Council scheme produced for internal consultation. This scheme consisted of a 90-member council representing 30 wards. Councillors Marbrow and Firth agreed with the City Council's justification for a 90-member council.

25 Councillors Marbrow and Firth considered the Council's proposal to be worthwhile and reasonable but simply felt that their proposal was better in terms of natural communities. The

Councillors' scheme was substantially different to the above schemes across the city, although their scheme did provide two similar wards to that of the City Council in the east and south of the city. The Councillors' scheme improved electoral equality with no ward varying by more than 7% from the city average in 2006.

### **Other representations**

26 A further 423 representations were received from local organisations, local political parties and local residents. Allerton Liberal Democrats objected to the City Council's proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward on the basis that no common community link existed between the two areas of Speke and Hunts Cross and that the areas were separated by significant natural barriers. Allerton Liberal Democrats forwarded a map which retained the link between Hunts Cross and Woolton. Hunts Cross Residents Association and 418 local residents also objected to the proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward on the same grounds as Allerton Liberal Democrats and supported Map C6, upon which the Labour Group scheme was based, which retained the link between Hunts Cross and Woolton. Hunts Cross Residents Association also forwarded a petition signed by a large number of local residents objecting to the proposed inclusion of Hunts Cross with Speke in a single ward.

27 Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation submitted details of a local consultation it carried out in relation to its area. It considered the points on which consensus was reached during the local consultation to have been recognised in the Council's proposal and expressed support for this proposal but added some additional boundary amendments. A suggestion was made to name the existing ward Croxteth ward rather than Gillmoss ward but stated that there were arguments for and against this. Where there was total agreement was that the current Croxteth ward needed to be renamed, but no alternative name was forwarded.

28 Councillors Hulme and Ousby supported the City Council's proposed Knotty Ash, West Derby and Yew Tree external ward boundaries but provided an alternative internal boundary between the three wards which they stated gave better electoral equality and better community identity than the City Council's proposal.

29 Councillors O'Donoghue and Marshall provided an alternative scheme for the existing Valley and Netherley wards stating that all proposals given during consultation were unacceptable to all councillors in both wards.

## 4 ANALYSIS AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

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

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

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

### **Electorate forecasts**

35 Since 1975 there has been an 18% decrease in the electorate of Liverpool City. Development instigated by regeneration has resulted in a shift of electors towards the regenerated areas, with the knock-on effect of many wards being substantially under-represented. The City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting a minimal decrease in the electorate from 340,481 to 338,928 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects the decrease to be spread throughout the city. In order to prepare these forecasts, the Council estimated rates and locations of housing development with regard to structure and local plans, the expected rate of building over the five-year period and assumed occupancy rates. Advice from the City Council on the likely effect on electorates of changes to ward boundaries has been obtained.

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

## **Council size**

37 Liverpool Borough Council presently has 99 members. The City Council proposed a council of 90 members. The City Council's Governance Review Group (GRG) considered the roles of elected members within the new constitution as compared to the roles for members under the traditional committee system before recommending to the Electoral Review Group that there should be a reduction of nine councillors to a council size of 90. It also considered that any substantial decrease in numbers of councillors would lessen the opportunity for members to effectively carry out their community representative role. The GRG highlighted key roles for members within the new governance arrangements and the considerable amount of time needed by members to undertake these roles. Finally and having considered all the detail the GRG believed that there was room for only marginal changes in the number of councillors if all roles envisaged by the government are to be adequately carried out. This proposed council size of 90 members received cross-party support and was further supported by Councillors Marbrow and Firth and the Labour Group with the latter adding the need to retain a high amount of councillors for effective scrutiny to ensure good governance and effective carrying out of the community champion role.

38 Having considered the representations received, given that there was cross-party consensus and as we have been convinced by the argumentation that 90 councillors would provide effective and convenient local government under the new political management system, we conclude that the achievement of electoral equality and the statutory criteria would best be met by a council of 90 members.

## **Electoral arrangements**

39 As each city-wide scheme received agreed on a council size of 90 members we were able to consider all proposed warding arrangements when formulating our draft recommendations and we looked at combining schemes where we felt they best met the statutory criteria. We noted areas of similarity between all schemes in the north and east of the city and in the south between the City Council and Councillors Marbrow and Firth's scheme. Each scheme provided for a different warding pattern throughout the remainder of the city. There were areas of consensus on ward names but where this was not evident we adopted the ward name proposed by the adopted scheme and where we put forward our own proposals we adopted the name we considered to best reflect the area.

40 After careful consideration of all the evidence received at Stage One we consider that the City Council's proposals would represent a better balance between the statutory criteria than the current arrangements or other schemes submitted at Stage One and we are content to endorse these proposals substantially. We consider that the City Council's proposals would provide the best reflection of community identities and interests across the city by using easily identifiable boundaries and respecting natural communities. In the mid-city to north area we consider the City Council to have utilised excellent boundaries while paying respect to natural communities such as that north and south of East Lancashire Road and in the Croxteth, Picton and West Derby areas. Its proposals would also offer excellent levels of electoral equality.

41 However, in order to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local communities' identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the City Council's proposals in the south and southwest of the city adopting the Labour Group's proposed Cressington and Speke-Garston wards while adopting our own Hunts Cross, Otterspool and St Michael's wards using boundaries put forward in each city-wide scheme. The Labour Group's scheme in this southern area best satisfies the statutory criteria as it retains the Hunts Cross and Woolton link and we note the local support for this proposal. We have also adopted Councillors Marbrow and Firth's proposed Belle Vale ward as it was the same as that proposed by the City Council and the Labour Group.

42 We propose minor boundary amendments across the city in the interests of community identity and also to tie boundaries to identifiable ground detail where they have become undefined or defaced. For city warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- (a) Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards;
- (b) Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot wards;
- (d) Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie wards;
- (e) Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards;
- (f) Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall wards;
- (g) Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton wards;
- (h) Arundel, Church and Picton wards;
- (i) Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown wards;
- (j) Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale wards;
- (k) Allerton, St Mary's and Speke wards.

43 Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2 and Map A1, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards**

44 The existing wards of Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck cover the northern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 6%, 33% and 34% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Fazakerley and Warbreck wards while deteriorating in Gillmoss ward to vary from the city average by 2%, 32% and 38% respectively by 2006.

45 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area be covered by three wards, with the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards being represented by three councillors each. It proposed that Warbreck ward should contain the majority of the existing ward with its southern boundary running south of Walton Hospital and Rice Lane until it reaches Queens Drive. It would then follow the rear of properties south of Carnarvon Court and Manorbier Crescent before running along the north of Walton Hall Park until it reached Walton Hall Avenue before finally following the rear of properties on the west side of Torrisholme Road and joining Stopgate Lane. Stopgate Lane, Long Lane, the railway line and the Trans Pennine Trail would provide the eastern boundary that divides the proposed Warbreck and Fazakerley wards with the remaining boundary being that of the city boundary.

46 The proposed Fazakerley ward would be bounded by the eastern Warbreck boundary while its southern boundary would follow the East Lancashire Road apart from when it would run along the rear of properties on the north side of Long Lane until reaching Lower Lane and rejoining East Lancashire Road, with the remainder of the boundary being the city boundary. Its proposed Gillmoss ward would contain all the properties bounded by East Lancashire Road, Lower House Lane and Dwerryhouse Lane while the boundary would also run to the rear of properties on the north side of Hollocombe Road and west of Ashwater Road before rejoining Oak Lane and following Croxteth Hall Lane. The proposed boundary would finally run to the north of properties off Coachmans Drive until it reaches the city boundary.

47 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 6%, 2% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Croxteth and Fazakerley wards and to deteriorate slightly in Warbreck ward to equal the city average and vary by 1% and 4% by 2006.

48 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards, with the proposed Fazakerley, Gillmoss and Warbreck wards being represented by three councillors each. Its proposed Warbreck ward boundary would follow Breeze Hill, to the south of Carnarvon Court and the rear of properties north of Carnarvon Road. The boundary would then continue along the rear of properties north of Manorbier Crescent and Gladstone Road and exclude all the properties south of Rice Lane until Stalemine Road. It would also exclude properties south of Hazeldale and Crescent Roads before joining the Trans Pennine Trail. The boundary would then run east along Charnock Road while following north along Stopgate and Long Lanes until reaching Hunslett Road. The proposed boundary should then follow the rear of properties south of Hunslett Road and west of Cedar Road before following Warbreck Moor until it reaches the city boundary. Its proposed Fazakerley ward would be bounded by the proposed Warbreck ward eastern boundary, the city boundary to the north and Long Lane, Lower Lane and East Lancashire Road until it reaches the city boundary.

49 The Labour Group's proposed Gillmoss ward boundary would be formed by East Lancashire Road, Lower House Lane and Dwerryhouse Lane while running south of De La Salle school and to the rear of properties number 45 to 58 on Merrydale Drive before joining Croxteth Hall Lane and Oak Lane North until it reaches the River Alt. The proposed boundary would also follow the River Alt and east along a track through the Eighteen Acres Plantation until it reaches the city boundary.

50 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Gillmoss, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 7%, 1% and 3% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Gillmoss ward and to deteriorate slightly in Fazakerley and Warbreck wards to vary from the city average by 3%, 5% and 5% by 2006.

51 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards, with the proposed Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors proposed that Warbreck ward boundary should run south of Walton Hospital, to the rear of properties on the north side of Gladstone Road then south and to the rear of properties north of Carnarvon Road before running eastward along the northern Walton Hall Park perimeter until it reached the Trans Pennine Trail. The proposed boundary would then run north along the trail turning eastward to Long Lane before Hartley Avenue, following Long Lane and Longmoor Lane before rejoining the Trans Pennine Trail until it reached the city boundary.

52 The Councillors proposed Fazakerley ward would be bounded by Brookfield Drive, Lower Lane and East Lancashire Road until it reaches the city boundary and would also share its western boundary with the proposed Warbreck ward boundary. Their proposed Croxteth ward would be bounded by the East Lancashire Road in the north and would follow Stonebridge Lane, Storrington Avenue, Lower House Lane, Dwerryhouse Lane, Oak Lane and Croxteth Hall Lane, until it reaches Exford Road, in the west. The boundary would then run to the rear of the properties north of Coachmans Drive before reaching the city boundary.

53 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 7%, 2% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Croxteth ward and to deteriorate slightly in Fazakerley and Warbreck wards to vary from the city average by 4%, 5% and 3% by 2006.

54 Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation carried out a local consultation exercise concerning its own area. The Community Federation considered that points upon which consensus was reached were reflected in the City Council's proposed Croxteth ward. It also

put forward some additional boundary amendments as it considered that the southwest Croxteth ward boundary needed more definition and also considered that the industrial area north of East Lancashire Road should be included in the proposed Croxteth ward. The Community Federation highlighted that due to local confusion the existing Croxteth ward should be renamed. It also suggested that there were arguments for and against naming the proposed City Council ward covering the northeastern area, Croxteth ward, also stating that many refer to this area as Croxteth.

55 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. We propose that the southern boundary of the proposed Warbreck ward should follow the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park as we consider this to be a more easily identifiable boundary and attached to better ground detail. We consider the City Council's proposals for the remainder of this area to utilise identifiable boundaries such as the railway line, Long Lane and Lower House Lane while grouping similar communities in single wards, in particular, the grouping of the entire urban area north of East Lancashire Road, formerly in Fazakerley ward, in the proposed Norris Green ward, as discussed later. We acknowledge the similarity in all three proposed easterly wards but again consider the Council's to best satisfy the statutory criteria in that it utilises identifiable boundaries in Croxteth Hall Lane and Dwerryhouse Lane, and facilitates the exclusion of the entire urban area both sides of Oak Lane from the proposed Croxteth ward which was supported by Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation.

56 We feel the local consultation carried out by Croxteth & Gillmoss Community Federation has merit and note the support it gives to the Council's proposal for this area. We also note the additional comments made by the Community Federation but consider that the Council's proposal best satisfies the statutory criteria in the northeastern area as it contains all those properties south of East Lancashire Road, east of Croxteth Hall Lane and Lower House Lane in a single ward therefore promoting a strong community identity. The Community Federation suggested that the existing Croxteth ward be renamed and also stated that many refer to the existing Gillmoss ward area as Croxteth and this has been reflected in the City Council's submission and our draft recommendations.

57 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Croxteth, Fazakerley and Warbreck wards by 6%, 2% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Croxteth and Fazakerley wards and to deteriorate slightly in Warbreck ward to equal the average and vary by 1% and 4% by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot wards**

58 The existing wards of Broadgreen, Croxteth and Dovecot cover the northeastern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 11%, 29% and 8% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Broadgreen and Dovecot wards while deteriorating in Croxteth ward to vary from the city average by 10%, 6% and 32% respectively by 2006.

59 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Knotty Ash, West Derby and Yew Tree wards being represented by three councillors each. The northern boundary of the City Council's proposed West Derby ward would follow Muirhead Avenue and the rear of properties on the north side of Oak Lane then Croxteth Hall Lane, Deysbrook Lane, Crown Road and Leyfield Road in the east. To the south it would follow Green Lane and Alder Road before following Eaton Road, Barnfield

Drive and Mill Lane to the west. The proposed Yew Tree ward boundary would consist of the city boundary to the east and the proposed West Derby ward boundary in the west. The proposed northern boundary would follow Deysbrook Lane and the rear of properties off Coachmans Drive with its southern boundary following East Prescott Road, Youens Way, to the rear of properties on the west side of Grange Avenue and Newbury Way and along Yew Tree Lane.

60 The Council proposed that the Knotty Ash ward's northern boundary should consist of the proposed West Derby and Yew Tree wards' southern boundaries with its eastern boundary being formed by the city boundary. To the south and west the boundary would be formed by the M62, Bowring Park Road and Queens Drive.

61 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Knotty Ash, Yew Tree and West Derby wards by 4%, 3% and equal to the city average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly in West Derby ward to vary from the city average by 2% by 2006. The electoral variances for Knotty Ash and Yew Tree wards are expected to remain constant over the next five years.

62 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Broadgreen, Country Park and Dovecot wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Country Park ward's northern boundary would be that of the proposed Clubmoor ward's southern boundary, with the eastern boundary following Croxteth Hall Lane and Princess Drive as far as Yew Tree Lane. The boundary would then run west on Yew Tree Lane, Honeys Green Lane and Alder Road before turning north on Queens Drive to Mill Lane. The proposed Dovecot ward boundary would be formed by the city boundary to the south and east with its northern boundary being the southern proposed Gillmoss ward boundary. To the west the proposed ward boundary would follow Croxteth Hall Lane, Princess Drive, Finch Lane, Haydn Road, Elgar Road, Kingsheath Avenue, East Prescott Road and Pilch Lane Road to the city boundary.

63 The proposed Broadgreen ward boundary would share its northern and eastern boundaries with the proposed Country Park and Dovecot wards and also the city boundary. To the south it would be bounded by Rocky Lane and Queens Drive with the western boundary being formed by Edge Lane, Mill Lane, St Oswalds Street, Broad Green Road, Prescott Road and then north to run along Queens Drive to Alder Road.

64 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Broadgreen, Country Park and Dovecot wards by 1%, 9% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in Dovecot and Country Park wards to vary by 1% and 5% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance of Broadgreen ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years.

65 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Broadgreen, Deysbrook and West Derby Village wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors proposed that the West Derby Village ward boundary be formed by Muirhead Avenue and Oak Lane in the north, Queens Drive in the west, Alder Road and Honeys Green Lane in the south with its eastern boundary following Croxteth Hall Lane, along the southern perimeter of West Derby Golf Course, Crown Road, Deysbrook Lane and Leyfield Road. The proposed Deysbrook ward would follow the city boundary, the rear of properties north of Coachmans Drive, along the south of West Derby Golf Course, Crown Road and Leyfield Road which is shared with the proposed West Derby Village ward. The proposed southern boundary would follow Yew Tree Lane, to the rear of properties west

of Grange Avenue and Newbury Way, Kingsheath Avenue, Dunchurch Road, Muirfield Close, Finch Lane and to the rear of properties south of Finch Lea Drive until it reached the city boundary.

66 The Councillors' proposed Broadgreen ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed West Derby Village ward and Deysbrook ward while it would also be bounded by the city boundary to the east and Queens Drive to the west. Its proposed southern boundary would follow the M62 and Bowring Park Road.

67 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council there would be good levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Broadgreen, Deysbrook and West Derby Village wards by 3%, 9% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve over the next five years in all wards to vary from the city average by 2%, 7% and 1% by 2006.

68 Councillors Hulme and Ousby agreed with the City Council's proposed external boundaries for Knotty Ash, West Derby and Yew Tree wards but submitted an alternative internal boundary which they considered allowed for more compact wards and greater numerical equality of voters. Councillors Hulme and Ousby considered that the City Council's scheme excluded some areas that are part of West Derby Village and proposed to vary from the Council's scheme by running the boundary along Blackmoor Road, west along Apsley Road then following Eaton Road, Central Drive and to the rear of properties west of Whinfall Road before reaching Alder Road and joining the external boundary at Queens Drive.

69 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one minor boundary amendment. We propose that the boundary between Knotty Ash and West Derby wards should follow Honeys Green Lane and Eaton Road before joining Alder Road. This amendment, we consider, promotes community identity by grouping all those properties north of Honeys Green Lane and both sides of Blackmoor Drive in a single ward. We also consider the City Council's proposed West Derby ward would promote community identity by grouping the urban area both sides of Oak Lane in a single ward. We did not consider either the Labour Group's or the Councillors' schemes in this area to best satisfy the statutory criteria as they both divided natural communities in the Fincham area and did not utilise the most identifiable boundaries in the area.

70 We note the similar external boundary for the three proposed wards in this area provided by the City Council and Councillors Marbrow and Firth but due to the City Council's external boundary being locally supported and given that it does not split the community both sides of Oak Lane, we consider the Council's boundary to best satisfy the statutory criteria.

71 We note the proposal forwarded by Councillors Hulme and Ousby and consider it to have merit while also noting its similarity to the Council's proposal in utilising the same external boundary grouping the three proposed wards and several internal boundaries from East Prescott Road to Honeys Green Lane and following Melwood Road in the north. However, having visited the area we consider the Council's proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area by using more identifiable boundaries in Alder Road and Leyfield Road, uniting properties both sides of Blackmoor Drive and providing excellent levels of electoral equality while respecting local communities.

72 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Knotty Ash, Yew Tree and West Derby wards by 5%, 3% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve slightly in Knotty Ash ward while deteriorating slightly in West Derby ward to vary from the city average by 4 % and 1% by

2006 respectively. The electoral variance for Yew Tree ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie wards**

73 The existing wards of Anfield, Clubmoor, County and Pirrie cover the mid-northern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 4%, 10%, 6% and 11% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield and County wards while deteriorating in Clubmoor and Pirrie wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 3%, 12% and 15% respectively by 2006.

74 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Norris Green ward would be bounded by Lower Lane, Muirhead Avenue East and Parthenon Drive and Lorenzo Drive in the west. The proposed ward should also contain the urban area immediately to the north of East Lancashire Road. Its proposed Clubmoor ward would be adjacent to the proposed Norris Green ward and share its western boundary. It proposed that the boundary should also follow Walton Hall Avenue and include the urban area on Stopgate Lane while running along Stanley Park Avenue and the railway to the west. The proposed southern boundary would run eastward south of Worcester Drive and along Cherry Lane, Lisburn Lane, Delamain Road and east along Muirhead Avenue until it reached Lorenzo Drive.

75 The City Council's proposed County ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Warbreck ward with the remainder of its boundary following Walton Hall Avenue, Stanley Park Avenue, the Bootle Rail Line and then Spellow Lane and Carisbrooke Road until it reached the city boundary. The proposed Anfield ward would share its north western boundary with the proposed County ward and run along the Bootle Rail Line, Townsend Lane, Lower Breck Road, west along the south side of Castlewood Road and north along Belmont Road, Oakfield Road and Walton Breck Road until it joins the proposed County ward boundary at Walton Lane.

76 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council there would be good levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards by 7%, 1%, 3% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards while deteriorating slightly in County ward to vary from the city average by 1%, equal to the average, 1% and 3% by 2006 respectively.

77 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, Clubmoor, Pirrie and Walton Park wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed that its Walton Park ward should contain the existing County ward with the inclusion of a large estate north of Walton Hall Park to the south of Crescent Road. There would also be a change to the existing southwest ward boundary as it would exclude properties to the south of Nimrod Street and Bardsay Road which are contained in the existing County ward. The proposed Anfield ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Walton Park ward before also following the railway line to the east, south along Darmonds Green Avenue, north of the properties on Breckside Park and along Belmont Grove, Castlewood Road, Sedley Street and Townsend Lane until it reached Walton Breck Road. The boundary would then follow Walton Breck Road until it reached Walton Lane before rejoining the shared boundary at Nimrod Street.

78 The proposed Pirrie ward would contain those properties on the south side of Long Lane and Charnock Road from the Trans Pennine Trail to Lower Lane and those bounded by

Lower Lane, Utting Avenue East. The boundary would then run south along the Trans Pennine Trail and west following Kilrea Close and Monash Road to Queens Drive. The boundary would then follow Queens Drive and Richard Kelly Drive before joining the ward boundary at Stopgate Lane. The Labour Group proposed that its Clubmoor ward should be bounded by Utting Avenue East in the north and Muirhead Avenue in the south while also including an urban area in the southeast straddling Oak Lane and to the west of Croxteth Hall Lane. It should also include an urban expanse in the southwest bounded by Monash Road, Eastman Road, the rear of properties east on Grenfell Road, Larkhill Lane, Lisburn Lane, Delamain Road, Muirhead Avenue, A5058, Mill Lane, Almond's Green, Almond's Grove and the boundary would also follow north on Parkside Drive until it reached Muirhead Avenue.

79 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Anfield, Clubmoor, Pirrie and Walton Park wards by 5%, 2%, 1% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield and Walton Park wards while deteriorating in Clubmoor and Pirrie wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 2%, 4% and 3% by 2006 respectively.

80 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area would be covered by four wards with the proposed Anfield, Clubmoor, Norris Green and Walton Park wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors proposed that Norris Green ward should comprise the existing Pirrie ward together with the southern part of the existing Fazakerley ward, the Storrington Avenue area from the existing Gillmoss Avenue and a small part of the existing County ward west of Abingdon Road. The proposed Clubmoor ward would be based on the existing Clubmoor ward with additions from the current Gillmoss, County and Tuebrook wards. It would be bounded by Muirhead Avenue, Utting Avenue East, Dwerryhouse Lane and the railway line in the west taking in the Cherry Lane and Larkhill Lane neighbourhoods.

81 The proposed Anfield ward should comprise the majority of the current Anfield ward, together with parts of the current County and Tuebrook wards. Its southeastern boundary would be formed by Breck Road, Townsend Lane and the southwestern boundary by Oakfield Road. The northern boundary is proposed to follow the north of Stanley Park, Stanley Park Avenue and Walton Hall Avenue. The Councillors' proposed Walton Village ward would consist of the majority of the current County ward and parts of the existing Melrose and Warbreck wards. The proposed ward boundary would run to the south of Walton Hospital and along the northern perimeter of Walton Hall Park and then follow Walton Hall Avenue, Stanley Park Avenue and along the northern perimeter of Stanley Park. The proposed boundary would also follow Spellow Lane, Walton Lane and Carisbrooke Road until it reached the city boundary.

82 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Anfield, Clubmoor, Norris Green and Walton Village wards by 2%, 1%, equal to the city average and 3% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Walton Village ward while deteriorating in Anfield, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 3%, 5% and 2% by 2006.

83 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. The northern boundary of the proposed County ward would follow the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park as detailed earlier. We consider the Council's proposals for the remainder of this area utilises good boundaries such as Lower House Lane and Parthenon Drive enabling the urban area north of East Lancashire Road to be included in a single Norris

Green ward and the area between East Lancashire Road and Muirhead Avenue to be split east and west forming the proposed Norris Green and Clubmoor wards which we consider best reflects the communities in the area and gives good levels of electoral equality.

84 We note that there is some similarity between the City Council's and Labour Group's proposed Anfield ward and also between the City Council's and Councillors proposed County ward but consider overall the City Council's scheme best satisfies the statutory criteria in the area as a whole. The City Council's proposed Anfield and County wards provide for excellent electoral equality while grouping similar communities in single wards by utilising boundaries such as the railway line, Stanley Park perimeter, Walton Lane and Walton Breck Road and we consider these to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area subject to the aforementioned amendment. We consider this proposed amendment, that runs along the western and southern perimeter of Walton Hall Park, to tie the boundary to better ground detail and it does not affect any electors.

85 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council there would be excellent levels of electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor varying from the city average in Anfield, County, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards by 7%, 1%, 3% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Anfield, Clubmoor and Norris Green wards while deteriorating slightly in County ward to vary by 1%, equal the city average, 1% and 3% by 2006 respectively. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards**

86 The existing wards of Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook cover the north-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average to equal the average, 4% and 10% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Tuebrook ward while deteriorating in Kensington and Old Swan wards to vary from the city average by 4%, 3% and 6% respectively by 2006.

87 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneyford wards all being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Kensington ward would be based on the current Kensington ward but would include the Phythian estate, bounded by West Derby Road, Low Hill, Edge Lane and Farnworth Street, include the whole of the Fairfield district and all but the Rocky Lane frontage of Newsham Park. Its eastern boundary would be formed by the railway line and to the south it would be formed by Edge Lane.

88 The Council's proposed Tuebrook & Stoneyford ward would be broadly based on the current Tuebrook ward and should exclude all but the Rocky Lane frontage of Newsham Park and those parts of the Pinehurst estate north of Townsend Lane while including the triangle bounded by Queens Drive, Mill Bank and Muirhead Avenue. The Council's proposed Old Swan ward boundary would follow the railway line to the west and south while following Mill Lane, Edge Lane and Queens Drive. The proposed northern boundary would run along Lister Drive, Green Lane, Derwent Road East, Derwent Road West and Derby Lane.

89 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneyford wards varies from the city average by 3%, 4% and 7% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 2% and 2% respectively by 2006.

90 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Kensington ward boundary would follow the railway line to the south and Botanic Road, Edge Lane, the rear of properties on the east side of Jubilee Drive and Kensington to the west. The northern boundary would comprise West Derby Road, Sheil Road and Gardners Drive while following the railway line, Prescott Road, Church Road, Montrose Way and Pighue Lane in the east. The proposed Tuebrook ward would share its southern boundary with the proposed Old Swan and Kensington wards while its western boundary would follow Belmont Road, Belmont Grove and the rear of properties north of Breckside Park to the railway line. The proposed boundary would then follow the railway line, along the south of Morella Road, Cherry Lane, Richard Kelly Drive and Queens Drive then along east and south of Grenfell Road, Eastman Road, Larkhill Lane, Lisburn Lane, Delamain Road, Muirhead Avenue and Queens Drive to Moscow Drive.

91 The Labour Group's proposed Old Swan ward would share its north and western boundaries with its proposed Kensington and Tuebrook wards. Its southern boundary would comprise Mill Lane, Long Lane and Rathbone Road with its eastern boundary following Queens Drive, Prescott Road, Broad Green Road, Montague Road, Mill Lane and Edge Lane.

92 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards would vary from the city average by 4%, 1% and equal to the city average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Kensington and Old Swan wards by equalling the city average by 2006 in both wards while deteriorating in Tuebrook ward to vary from the city average by 5% by 2006.

93 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Kensington & Fairfield ward would consist of the majority of the existing Kensington ward with its northern boundary formed by West Derby Road and its eastern by the railway line. Edge Lane would be used as the southern boundary and the proposed Kensington & Fairfield ward would also include the Phythian estate.

94 The proposed Tuebrook ward would contain much of the existing Tuebrook ward and the boundary would follow Belmont Road, Breck Road, Townsend Lane, West Derby Road, Queens Drive and the railway line. Its northeastern boundary would run to the rear of properties on the north side of Forfar Road, along Glengariff Street, Alison Road, Delamain Road and Muirhead Avenue. They proposed that their proposed Old Swan ward boundary should follow Edge Lane to the south, Queens Drive to the east and the railway line to the west with the proposed northern boundary following Lister Drive, Green Lane, south of Moscow Drive, including Tynwald Hill and Woburn Road.

95 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook wards would vary from the city average by 5%, 4% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Kensington & Fairfield ward and Old Swan ward while deteriorating slightly in Tuebrook ward to vary from the city average by 2%, 1% and 3% respectively by 2006.

96 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to one boundary amendment. We propose adopting the Councillors' proposed Kensington ward western boundary as it unites all the properties on Jubilee Drive in a single ward and we consider this to promote community identity. The Council's proposals for the remainder of this area utilise excellent boundaries such as the railway line, Edge Lane, Queens Drive, Townsend Lane and West Derby Road

while grouping similar communities within these boundaries in single wards. We note the similarities between the City Council and the Councillors' schemes in this area but consider the Council's scheme to best satisfy the statutory criteria across the three proposed wards and given their position at the centre of the city, these wards also facilitate the warding arrangements in the surrounding areas.

97 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Kensington & Fairfield, Old Swan and Tuebrook & Stoneyford wards would vary from the city average by 3%, 4% and 7% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards, to vary from the city average by 1%, 2% and 2% respectively by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall wards**

98 The existing wards of Breckfield, Everton, Melrose and Vauxhall cover the northwestern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 18%, 35%, 6% and 48% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Everton and Vauxhall wards while deteriorating in Breckfield and Melrose wards to vary from the city average by 14%, 46%, 22% and 13% respectively.

99 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Kirkdale ward would be bounded by the city boundary to the north and west, with its eastern boundary following Scotland Road, Everton Valley and Walton Lane. The proposed southern ward boundary would follow Leeds Street. The proposed Everton ward boundary would follow Everton Valley, Scotland Road, Byrom Street, Islington, West Derby Road, Belmont Road, Oakfield Road and Walton Breck Road. The ward would feature Everton Park and Everton Brow at its heart.

100 The proposed Central ward would extend eastwards from the waterfront office complexes and the Main Office Area to include much of the main retail area, the London Road retail area and student accommodations and the Kensington Fields area off Kensington/Edge Lane. The boundaries of Leeds Street, Byrom Street and Islington would be used for the northern boundary while to the east and south part of Smithdown Lane, Falkner Street, Myrtle Street, Hardman Street and Renshaw Street would be used as boundaries.

101 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards varies from the city average by 19%, 5% and 6% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006.

102 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Breckfield, Kirkdale and Scotland Road wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group proposed that its Kirkdale ward should comprise the existing Melrose ward with the addition of a large area of the present Vauxhall ward from the city boundary with Bootle, down to Boundary Street. The proposed Breckfield ward would be an amalgamation of the present Breckfield ward and a substantial portion of the existing Everton ward with a revised boundary comprising Netherfield Road, West Derby Road and Walton Breck Road.

103 Its proposed Scotland Road ward would consist of much of the current Vauxhall and Everton communities and would be bounded by the river to the west and Boundary Street

and Anderson Street to the north. The boundary would also follow Netherfield Road, Shaw Street, Moss Street, Daulby Street, Pembroke Place and Great Newton Street to the east before following Brownlow Hill, Ranelagh Street, Hanover Street, Canning Place, Wapping, Gower Street to the river in the south.

104 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Breckfield, Kirkdale and Scotland Road wards would vary from the city average by 1%, 5% and 18% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Kirkdale and Scotland Road wards while deteriorating slightly in Breckfield ward to equal the city average and vary by 3% and 2% respectively by 2006.

105 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Breckfield, City and Vauxhall & Kirkdale wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors proposed that their Vauxhall & Kirkdale ward should comprise parts of the existing Vauxhall and Melrose wards. The northern boundary would be formed by the border with Sefton Metropolitan Borough Council and the western boundary would be defined by the river. To the east, Carisbrooke Road, Westminster Road, St Domingo Road, Heyworth Street and Everton Road would constitute the boundary. The southern boundary would follow Brow Village, Roscommon Street, Great Homer Street, Scotland Road, Leeds Street and Paisley Street to the river. The Councillors' proposed Breckfield ward would comprise much of the current Breckfield ward with additions from existing surrounding wards with its western boundary largely formed by St Domingo Road and the southern boundary by West Derby Road. At the eastern edge, Belmont Road and Oakfield Road would form the border with the proposed Tuebrook and Anfield wards with the northern boundary formed by the perimeter of Stanley Park, Spellow Lane and Westminster Road.

106 The Councillors' proposed City ward would be formed by parts of the current Abercromby, Everton and Smithdown wards with the western boundary formed by the river and the northern boundary by Leeds Street, Scotland Road, Roscommon Street and Netherfield Road South. The southern boundary would comprise the major roads of Hanover Street, Mount Pleasant and Myrtle Street while to the east it would be bounded by Everton Road, the A57, the rear of properties on the east side of Jubilee Drive, North View, Mount Vernon, Crown Street and Grove Street.

107 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Breckfield, City and Vauxhall & Kirkdale wards would vary from the city average by 3%, 15% and 6% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in City ward to vary from the city average by 6% by 2006. The electoral variances for Breckfield ward and Vauxhall & Kirkdale ward are expected to remain constant over the next five years.

108 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area with one minor boundary modification. We propose adopting the Councillors' proposed Kensington & Fairfield western boundary to include all the properties on Jubilee Drive in a single ward as previously mentioned. We consider the City Council's scheme in the remainder of this area to best satisfy the statutory criteria by utilising excellent boundaries in the form of Walton Breck Road, Kirkdale Road, Leeds Street and West Derby Road while respecting communities within these boundaries and grouping the town centre in a single Central ward. The proposed Everton and Kirkdale wards are also bounded by easily identifiable main roads and group similar communities together such as the dockside community in the proposed Kirkdale ward. We do not consider any of the other city-wide schemes to better reflect the statutory criteria in this area.

109 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Central, Everton and Kirkdale wards would vary from the city

average by 19%, 5% and 6% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton wards**

110 The existing wards of Childwall, Netherley, Valley and Woolton cover the eastern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the four wards varies from the city average by 26%, 45%, 30% and 18% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly in all wards to vary from the city average by 27%, 46%, 31% and 20% respectively.

111 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed Childwall, Valley and Woolton wards being represented by three councillors each. The Council proposed that its Valley ward should be bounded by the Trans Pennine Trail as far as Walsingham Road where it proposed that the boundary should follow the rear of the properties on the southern side of the road then along Chelwood Avenue and to the rear of the properties on the north side of Thornton Road until it reached the city boundary. Its proposed Woolton ward would include the majority of the current ward except that its southern boundary would follow Kings Drive and would also include an area in the northwest bounded by Hornby Lane, Druids Cross Road, Gipsy Lane and Woolton Road and an area in the northeast immediately north of Well Lane. The proposed Childwall ward would be bounded in the southeast by the proposed Woolton and Valley ward boundaries while also following the M62 and Edge Lane in the north before running along the railway line and south along Northway South and east on Thingwall Road, before joining Queens Drive until it reaches Woolton Road.

112 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Childwall, Valley and Woolton wards would vary from the city average by 1%, 2% and 4% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Valley and Woolton wards while deteriorating in Childwall ward to equal the city average, and vary by 2% and 2% respectively by 2006.

113 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Belle Vale, Calderstones and Childwall wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Belle Vale ward would be identical to that of the City Council's proposed Valley ward as described earlier. Its proposed Childwall ward boundary would follow Rocky Lane, south along Queens Drive and Allerton Road before going east along Calderstones Road and Druids Cross Road until it reached Hornby Lane. The proposed boundary would then follow Hornby Lane and Woolton Road before following to the rear of the properties on Quickswood Drive and Childwall Lane and finally along Well Lane until it reached the Trans Pennine Trail.

114 The proposed Calderstones ward boundary would follow the Trans Pennine Trail in the east, the proposed Childwall ward southern boundary in the north and Mather Avenue in the west until it reached Heath Road. Here the boundary would move eastward following Allerton High Street, north along Acrefield Road and east on Gateacre Brow before following south on Halewood Road until it reached the Gateacre Hall Hotel where it would move eastward to the Trans Pennine Trail.

115 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Belle Vale, Calderstones and Childwall wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 3% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected

to improve in Belle Vale ward to equal the city average while deteriorating slightly in Calderstones and Childwall wards to vary by 5% and 4% by 2006.

116 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Gateacre wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Belle Vale ward would be the same as the City Council's proposed Valley ward as described earlier. Its proposed Childwall ward boundary would follow the M62, Edge Lane then south along Queens Drive and Menlove Avenue until it reached Druids Cross Road. The proposed boundary would then follow the rear of properties on the east side of Hornby Lane and to the south of properties on Hornby Park and The Copse before rejoining Woolton Road and moving eastward to the north of the properties on Quickswood Drive and the rear of Childwall Lane. The boundary would finally follow Well Lane until it reached the Trans Pennine Trail.

117 The Councillors' proposed Gateacre ward would be bounded by the city boundary, Trans Pennine Trail and the southeast proposed Childwall boundary. Its western boundary would follow south along Woolton Road, Blackwood Avenue, Church Road and east along Allerton Road before following Speke Road and west on Allerton High Street. The boundary would then run south along Hillfoot Road and eastward to the city boundary and run north of the properties on Camphill Road, Winchester Close, Waylands Drive, Speke Road and Greenacre Road.

118 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Gateacre wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 1% and equal to the average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Belle Vale ward to equal the city average by 2006 while deteriorating slightly in Childwall and Gateacre wards to vary from the city average by 2% and 1% respectively by 2006.

119 Councillors O'Donoghue and Marshall provided an alternative to the current Netherley and Valley wards within the city. They stated that in all proposals brought forward by the City Council it was intended to merge the existing wards and that this was unacceptable to councillors from both wards. They highlighted that their proposal would mean that only six councillors would be dealing with problems arising from the Loop Line rather than twelve as with the other proposals and that their proposal enhances local links with local services.

120 The Councillors' proposal involved having two wards. The proposed Gateacre East ward would be bounded by Madeira Drive and Chislehurst Avenue to the north and the boundary would follow Halewood Road and Grange Lane in the west until it reached the city boundary. The second proposed ward, Gateacre West ward, would be bounded by the city boundary and the above proposed boundary in the east. It would also follow the M62, Bowlam Drive, Barnham Drive, Well Lane, Childwall Abbey Road before following Childwall Park Avenue, Woolton Road and Acrefield Road until it reached the B5171. It would then follow Kings Drive eastward until it reached the city boundary. However, we received no detailed electorate figures to accompany this submission.

121 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to two boundary amendments and one ward name change. We propose amending the proposed Childwall ward's western boundary to follow the rear of properties on Northway (Nos. 32 to 74). We also propose amending the boundary between the proposed Childwall and Woolton wards to include all properties north on Well Lane in the proposed Woolton ward. All three city-wide submissions provided the same easterly ward in this area and due to the consensus on the proposed ward name of Belle Vale we propose this as the ward name, as we consider it would best reflect the local area.

122 We consider the City Council's proposals for the remainder of this area best satisfy the statutory criteria by utilising strong boundaries such as the Trans Pennine Trail, Queens Drive, Edge Lane, Menlove Avenue and Woolton Road while providing excellent levels of electoral equality and as far as possible grouping the respective Childwall and Woolton communities in single wards.

123 We note Councillors O'Donoghue and Marshall's alternative for the existing Netherley and Valley wards but do not consider their scheme to be a better option than that forwarded by all three city-wide submissions as their proposal spanned the Trans Pennine Trail and split part of Woolton. It also did not facilitate the adoption of a suitable warding arrangement for the surrounding area. In the absence of current and projected figures for the proposal we endeavoured to find out the electorates for the proposed wards and found they resulted in poorer electoral variances than our draft recommendations.

124 Under our draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Belle Vale, Childwall and Woolton wards would vary from the city average by 2%, equal to the average and 4% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Belle Vale and Woolton wards to equal the city average and vary by 2% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance in Childwall ward is expected to deteriorate slightly to vary by 1% from the city average by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Arundel, Church and Picton wards**

125 The existing wards of Arundel, Church and Picton cover the south-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 7%, 45% and 8% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Arundel and Picton wards to vary from the city average by 5% and 1% respectively. The electoral variance in Church ward is expected to remain constant.

126 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by four wards with the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Church ward boundary would follow the railway line, Booker Avenue, Yew Tree Road, Menlove Avenue, Druids Cross Road, Hornby Lane and Woolton Road. It would share its northern boundary with the proposed Wavertree ward. The City Council's proposed Picton ward would be similar to the current ward and part of its boundary would comprise Edge Lane and the ward would contain the Wavertree Technology Park. The boundary would also run along Picton Road, Gainsborough Road and Smithdown Road, extending westward to encompass the Edge Hill district and following the railway line and Gainsborough Road to the east. To the south the proposed boundary would follow the lower end of the cemetery, Fern Grove and Lodge Lane.

127 Its proposed Wavertree ward boundary would comprise, in the north and east, the railway line, Northway, Southway, Thingwall Road and Queens Drive. To the west and south it would be formed by the railway line, Allerton Road, Heathfield Road and Woolton Road to Queens Drive. The City Council's proposed Greenbank ward would share its north and eastern boundary with its proposed Picton and Wavertree wards and would also follow Penny Lane and the railway line in the east. Its proposed western boundary would follow Sefton Park Road, Mossley Hill Drive, Carnatic Road, Mossley Hill Road and Rose Lane to the railway line.

128 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards would equal the city average and vary by 3%, 9% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Picton ward while deteriorating slightly in Greenbank and Wavertree

wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 4% and 3% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance for the proposed Church ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years.

129 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Greenbank Park, Picton and Wavertree Green wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Picton ward boundary would follow Smithdown Road, Tunnel Road, B5178, the railway line, Rathbone Road, Picton Road and the railway line. The proposed Wavertree Green ward would share its eastern boundary with the proposed Picton ward while its northern boundary would follow Long Lane, Mill Lane and the railway line. The east and southern boundaries would follow Queens Drive and the A562 to the railway line.

130 The Labour Group proposed that its Greenbank Park ward boundary should be formed by Croxteth Road and Ullet Road to the west side and Smithdown Road to the east. The northern boundary would follow Hartington Road while the southern boundary would run along Rose Lane and Elmswood Road and to the rear of those properties on the east side of Victoria Road to Sefton Park.

131 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Greenbank Park, Picton and Wavertree Green wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 6% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Picton and Wavertree Green wards while deteriorating slightly in Greenbank Park ward to equal the city average, equal the city average and vary by 4% respectively in 2006.

132 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by four wards with the proposed Mossley Hill, Picton, Smithdown and Wavertree wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Picton ward's entire northern boundary would be formed by Edge Lane with the western boundary being formed by Grove Street and Crown Street. The southern boundary would follow the A562, Tunnel Road, Spekeland Road, Spofforth Road, Lawrence Road and north along Wellington Road and High Street. The boundary would also run along Sandown Lane and to the rear of the properties on the south side of Sandown and Bonchurch Drive to the railway line. The proposed Wavertree ward boundary would consist of Edge Lane to the north and Queens Drive in the east while the Childwall Road would be used in the south. To the west Wavertree Park and Wellington Road would be used as boundaries.

133 The Councillors' proposed Mossley Hill ward boundary would follow Mossley Hill Drive, Aigburth Vale, North Sudley Road, Barkhill Road, Mentmore Road, Kylemore Avenue, Rose Lane, Allerton Road and Smithdown Road until it reaches Ullet Road. The proposed boundary would then follow Ullet Road until it reached Mossley Hill Drive. The proposed Smithdown ward boundary would follow the railway line in the east, Lodge Lane and Sefton Park Road in the west and Ullet Road and Smithdown Road in the south. The proposed northern boundary would follow Spekeland Road, Webster Road, Lawrence Road and Gainsborough Road to the railway line.

134 Under the Councillors' proposal for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Mossley Hill, Picton, Smithdown and Wavertree wards would vary from the city average by 3%, 9%, 6% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Smithdown, Picton and Wavertree wards while deteriorating slightly in Mossley Hill ward to vary from the city average by 1%, 3%, equal to the average and 6% respectively by 2006.

135 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area subject to two boundary amendments. We propose amending the boundary between the proposed Wavertree and Childwall wards to include a

part of Northway as detailed earlier. We also propose amending the boundary between the proposed St. Michael's and Greenbank wards so that the boundary follows to the rear of properties on Mossley Hill Drive (Nos. 1 to 7). We consider these proposed amendments to further promote the high level of community identity already achieved by the City Council in this area by grouping similar communities in single wards and in the case of Mossley Hill Drive we consider these properties look towards Sefton Park on a community level. We consider the City Council's proposals to best satisfy the statutory criteria in the remainder of the area by utilising strong boundaries along Queens Drive, the railway line and Edge Lane while uniting the majority of Wavertree and student communities in single wards in the proposed Wavertree and Greenbank wards respectively. The Council's proposed Picton ward would be closely related to the existing Picton ward and groups the similar terraced housing in a single ward therefore promoting community identity. The proposed Church ward utilises the easily identifiable boundaries of the railway line, Woolton Road and Yewtree Road and groups an area with Calderstones Park as a community focus in a single ward.

136 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Church, Greenbank, Picton and Wavertree wards would equal the city average and vary by 2%, 9% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Picton ward while deteriorating slightly in Greenbank and Wavertree wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 3% and 3% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance for the proposed Church ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown wards**

137 The existing wards of Abercromby, Granby and Smithdown cover the west-central area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 5%, 20% and 17% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate in all wards to vary from the city average by 24%, 21% and 20% respectively by 2006.

138 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards being represented by three councillors each. The Council proposed that its Riverside ward should comprise the majority of the current Abercromby ward together with the bulk of the existing Dingle ward as far as Dingle Lane. The river would bound one side of the proposed ward and its western boundary would run along Hanover Street, Renshaw Street, Hardeman Street and then to Hope Street. To the east, Park Road would be used as a boundary before departing from it to follow the more easterly line of Windsor Street. The Council's proposed Princes Park ward would comprise the existing Granby ward and a part of the current Abercromby ward, north of Upper Parliament Street. The proposed ward would be bounded by Ullet Road to the southeast, Lodge Lane to the east and Park Road to the southwest.

139 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards would vary from the city average by 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Riverside ward while deteriorating slightly in Princes Park ward to vary from the city average by 1% and 4% respectively by 2006.

140 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Granby, Riverside and University wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Riverside ward would be bounded by Gower Street, Wapping, Canning Place, Hanover Street, Ranelagh Street and would also follow Renshaw Street, Leece Street, Hardman Street, Hope Street, Falkner Street, Catharine Street and Upper

Parliament Street. The boundary would continue along St James Place, Park Place, Park Road, then around a playing field and recreation ground, Dingle Vale, Dingle Lane, along waste ground between Promenade Gardens and Shorefields Village and to the river from Royden Way. It proposed that its Granby ward should contain the existing Granby ward along with an area east of Lodge Lane to the cemetery, and an area west of Windsor Street to Park Place.

141 The Labour Group's proposed University ward would be bounded to the south and east by the proposed Granby and Riverside wards and its north and eastern boundary would follow Brownlow Hill, Great Newton Street, Pembroke Place, Prescott Street, Kensington Street, before running south along Jubilee Drive, Edge Lane, Botanic Road, Wavertree Road and along Tunnel Road until it reached Smithdown Road.

142 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Granby, Riverside and University wards would vary from the city average by 6%, 13% and equal to the average respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Granby and Riverside wards while deteriorating in University ward to vary from the city average by 3%, equal to the average and 1% respectively by 2006.

143 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by two wards with the proposed St James' and Toxteth wards being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed St James' ward would utilise Hanover Street as its northern boundary with the easterly and southerly boundaries being formed by Grove Street, Upper Parliament Street, Windsor Street and Harlow Street. The proposed Toxteth ward would comprise the existing Granby ward and parts of the current Dingle ward. The southern boundary would follow Lodge Lane, the western boundary would be formed by the river and the eastern boundary formed by part of Upper Parliament Street.

144 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed St James' and Toxteth wards varies from the city average by 12% and 3% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in St James' ward while deteriorating slightly in Toxteth ward to vary from the city average by 4% and 4% respectively by 2006.

145 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the City Council's proposals for this area without modification. We consider the Council's scheme to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area by grouping the similar riverside community in the proposed Riverside ward while also proposing a Princes Park ward that groups a similar community within its strong boundaries that would follow Ullet Road, Lodge Lane and Park Road. We note the other proposals for this area and consider that they have merit but we feel the Council's scheme best utilises the strong boundaries available in the area while respecting the riverside and Princes Park communities.

146 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Princes Park and Riverside wards would vary from the city average by 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Riverside ward while deteriorating slightly in Princes Park ward to vary from the city average by 1% and 4% respectively by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale wards**

147 The existing wards of Aigburth, Dingle and Grassendale cover the southwestern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the

city average by 34%, 3% and 16% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Dingle ward while deteriorating in Aigburth and Grassendale wards to vary from the city average by 1%, 38% and 18% respectively.

148 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by two wards with the proposed St Michael's and Sudley wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow Dingle Road, Dingle Lane, Ullet Road as far as Mossley Hill Drive, then Mossley Hill Drive, Aigburth Road and along Jericho Lane to the river. Its proposed Sudley ward boundary would follow Jericho Lane, Mossley Hill Drive, Carnatic Road, Mossley Hill Road, Rose Lane and the railway line to the east. Its southern boundary would run from the river to the rear of Greenaways Special School, along Beechwood Road, Aigburth Road, Ranelagh Drive, Darby Road, Aigburth Hall Road, Brodie Avenue and Booker Avenue to the railway line.

149 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed St Michael's and Sudley wards would vary from the city average by 2% and 4% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in both wards to equal the city average and vary by 2% respectively by 2006.

150 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by two wards with the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow Royden Way, Ellerman Road, south of Shorefields Village, eastwards at the north of Promenade Gardens, south of Shorefields School site and along playing field and recreation ground beside Colebroke Road. The boundary would then follow Dingle Lane, Ullet Road, Ullet Walk, Croxteth Drive, Greenbank Drive, Mossley Hill Drive, Aigburth Vale and to the rear of properties off Jericho Lane before finally joining Jericho Lane to the river. The proposed Otterspool ward boundary would be formed by the river, Riversdale Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue, Booker Avenue and Mather Avenue to Rose Lane. The proposed Otterspool ward's northern boundary would be shared by the proposed St Michael's and Greenbank Park wards utilising the majority of Rose Lane.

151 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards would vary from the city average by 1% and 5% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in both wards to equal the average and vary by 3% respectively by 2006.

152 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by two wards with the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards being represented by three councillors each. The proposed Otterspool ward's western boundary would follow the river and it would follow the railway line to the east. The northern boundary would comprise Rose Lane, Kylemore Avenue, Mentmore Avenue, Barkhill Road and then run along North Sudley Road to Aigburth Vale. Jericho Lane would form the last part of the boundary to the river. The southern boundary would be shared with the proposed Garston ward boundary. The proposed St Michael's ward boundary would comprise the river, Jericho Lane, Aigburth Vale, and the outer perimeter of Sefton Park in the east and south. To the north, Ullet Road running into Dingle Lane would provide the boundary.

153 Under the Councillors' scheme of a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards would vary from the city average by 4% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in St Michael's ward while deteriorating slightly in Otterspool ward to equal the city average and vary by 6% respectively by 2006.

154 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we did not consider any of the proposed schemes to best satisfy the statutory criteria in this area and we

therefore propose adopting our own proposals for this area. Also in order to integrate the two adopted schemes in the north and south of the City together we needed to create our own scheme in the remainder of the area using boundaries put forward under all three city-wide schemes. The proposed St Michael's ward boundary would follow the City Council's proposed St Michael's ward boundary, apart from running to the rear of properties on Mossley Hill Drive (Nos. 1 to 7), until it reached Aigburth Road, then it would follow the rear of properties on Jericho Lane as proposed by the Labour Group and to the rear of properties south of Fulwood Park until it reached the river. All three wards proposed in each city-wide scheme were similar but we consider our proposal to best satisfy the statutory criteria as it utilises better boundaries in the area and groups communities such as those on Mossley Hill Drive and Jericho Lane in wards into which they have access.

155 We therefore propose adopting our own Otterspool ward. The proposed Otterspool ward would share its boundary with the proposed St Michael's and Greenbank wards to the north while its southern boundary would be shared with that of the Labour Group's proposed Cressington ward apart from following the railway to the west of the cricket club and to the rear of Greenaways Special School and properties on the south side of Riversdale Road. To the east the boundary would run along the railway line as proposed by the City Council. We consider this ward to best satisfy the statutory criteria for this area as it uses more identifiable boundaries and provides better community identity by grouping properties to the north of Beechwood Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue and west of the railway line in a single ward. Our proposal also provides good levels of electoral equality while facilitating the integration of both adopted schemes and we consider the ward name of Otterspool would best reflect the area.

156 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Otterspool and St Michael's wards would vary from the city average by 7% and 4% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in all wards to vary from the city average by 5% and 1% respectively by 2006. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

### **Allerton, St Mary's and Speke wards**

157 The existing wards of Allerton, St Mary's and Speke cover the southern area of the city and each ward is represented by three members. Under the current arrangements of a 99-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the three wards varies from the city average by 18%, 13% and 40% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to deteriorate slightly in all wards to vary from the city average by 19%, 18% and 44% respectively.

158 At Stage One the City Council proposed that this area should be covered by three wards with the proposed St Mary's, Speke & Hunts Cross and Springwood wards being represented by three councillors each. The City Council's proposed Springwood ward boundary would comprise the railway line, Booker Avenue, Yew Tree Lane, Menlove Avenue, Woolton High Street and Kings Drive. The southern boundary would run to the rear of the properties on the north side of Camphill Road, Winchester Close, Waylands Drive, Speke Road and Greenacre Road. The proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Springwood ward while its eastern and southern boundary would be the city boundary. To the west the boundary would follow Speke Hall Road then through the airport to the river. The Council's proposed St Mary's ward would share its northern boundary with the proposed Sudley ward while its eastern boundary would follow the railway line. To the west it would be bounded by the river and Speke Hall Road and the airport would provide its southern boundary.

159 Under the City Council's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed St Mary's, Speke & Hunts Cross and Springwood wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 1% and 2% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in St Mary's and Springwood wards while deteriorating slightly in Speke & Hunts Cross ward to vary from the city average by 1%, 1% and 5% respectively.

160 The Labour Group proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Cressington, Speke-Garston and Hunts Cross wards all being represented by three councillors each. The Labour Group's proposed Cressington ward boundary would run along Riversdale Road, Aigburth Hall Avenue, Booker Avenue, Mather Avenue, Woolton Road, the railway line, Seddon Road and Garston Docks while the remainder of the boundary would be formed by the river. The proposed Speke-Garston ward would comprise the area within the railway line in the north and the city boundary to the east and south. It would share its western boundary with the proposed Cressington ward boundary. The Council's proposed Hunts Cross ward boundary would run along the city boundary, the railway line and Mather Avenue. To the north the boundary would follow the Trans Pennine Trail, the Nook, Halewood Road, Gateacre Brow, Acrefield Road, Woolton Street, High Street, Allerton Road and Woolton Golf Course.

161 Under the Labour Group's proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Cressington, Hunts Cross and Speke-Garston wards would vary from the city average by 3%, 3% and 8% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Cressington and Speke-Garston wards while deteriorating slightly in Hunts Cross ward to vary from the city average by 2%, 3% and 4% respectively by 2006.

162 Councillors Marbrow and Firth proposed that this area be covered by three wards with the proposed Calderstones, Garston and Woodend being represented by three councillors each. The Councillors' proposed Calderstones ward is centred around Calderstones Park and its northern, eastern and southern borders are shared with the proposed Garston, Gateacre and Woodend wards. The railway line, Rose Lane and Allerton Road would form the western border and the ward boundary would also comprise Menlove Avenue and Druids Cross Lane. The proposed Garston ward boundary is formed by the river in the south while its eastern border is defined by the proposed Woodend ward. To the north the boundary runs along the railway line, Brunt Lane, Woolton Road, Springwood Avenue and Mather Avenue with the western boundary running between Grassendale and Garston. The Councillors' proposed Woodend ward is the same as the City Council's proposed Speke & Hunts Cross ward.

163 Under the Councillors' proposals for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Calderstones, Garston and Woodend wards would vary from the city average by 2%, 2% and 1% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Garston and Calderstones wards while deteriorating slightly in Woodend ward to equal the city average and vary by 1% and 5% respectively by 2006.

164 Allerton Liberal Democrats objected to the inclusion of Hunts Cross with Speke in a single ward arguing that it did not reflect communities of interest and the City Council's proposed ward would remove the Hunts Cross area from its traditional community links with Allerton and Woolton areas. Allerton Liberal Democrats highlighted the links between the areas of Speke and Garston which it proposed including in a single ward bounded by the city boundary and the railway line in the north, Garston Way and west to the river before Dock Road. They also emphasises the significant physical barriers of a dual carriageway and industrial estate between Hunts Cross and Speke areas.

165 Hunts Cross Residents Association objected to the City Council's proposed inclusion of Hunts Cross with Speke in a single ward and cited the same reasons as that of Allerton Liberal Democrats arguing that it did not reflect communities of interest and that it crossed

physical barriers. The Residents Association supported Map C6, upon which the Labour Group scheme was based, which grouped Speke with Garston and retained the Hunts Cross and Woolton area link. A petition signed by a large number of local residents which opposed being linked with Speke area was also forwarded by the Residents Association. We received 418 representations from local Hunts Cross residents who also opposed being grouped in a ward with Speke and cited the aforementioned issues as reasons.

166 Having considered all the representations received at Stage One we propose adopting the Labour Group's proposed Speke-Garston and Cressington wards with a minor modification. We propose our own Hunts Cross ward using boundaries put forward in the City Council and Labour Group city-wide schemes. We propose amending the proposed Speke-Garston ward's western boundary with the proposed Cressington ward to include all the properties south of the railway line and east of Garston Way which we consider will provide better community identity by grouping all these properties in a single Speke-Garston ward. The proposed Hunts Cross ward boundary would follow those boundaries suggested by the City Council; however, in the south its boundary would follow the railway line the entire way to the city boundary and its western boundary would run along Mather Avenue as proposed by the Labour Group.

167 We have been persuaded by the argumentation stating that there are no community links between Hunts Cross and Speke areas and we consider that the proposed Speke-Garston ward best satisfies the statutory criteria in this area as it utilises strong boundaries such as the railway line and it facilitates the retention of having Hunts Cross in a single ward with Allerton and Woolton which promotes community identity as they are similar communities. The proposed Speke-Garston ward has also received a large quantity of local support from residents and is similar to that proposed by Allerton Liberal Democrats. We noted the City Council and Councillors' scheme for this southern area but did not consider these proposals satisfied the statutory criteria in that they grouped separate communities together which are divided by strong natural boundaries and an industrial estate in a single ward.

168 Under the draft recommendations for a 90-member council, the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Cressington, Hunts Cross and Speke-Garston wards would equal the city average, and vary by 4% and 10% respectively. This level of electoral equality is projected to improve in Hunts Cross and Speke-Garston wards to vary from the city average by 3% and 5% respectively by 2006. The electoral variance for Cressington ward is expected to remain constant over the next five years. Our draft recommendations are set out in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and the large maps.

## **Electoral cycle**

169 Under section 7(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, all Metropolitan cities have a system of elections by thirds.

## **Conclusions**

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

- there should be a reduction in council size from 99 to 90;
- there should be 30 wards;
- the boundaries of 33 of the existing wards should be modified, resulting in a net reduction of three wards, and no ward should retain its existing boundaries.

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

- we propose adopting the Labour Group's proposed Speke-Garston and Cressington wards with one minor amendment;
- we propose adopting our own Otterspool, Hunts Cross and St Michael's wards using boundaries put forward by all three city-wide submissions;
- we have made several minor boundary amendments between the proposed Childwall and Woolton wards, Childwall and Wavertree wards, Picton and Old Swan wards, Knotty Ash and West Derby wards, Central and Kensington & Fairfield wards and County and Warbreck wards in order to group similar communities in single wards or to tie boundaries to better ground detail.

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

*Table 5: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements*

	2001 electorate		2006 forecast electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	99	90	99	90
Number of wards	33	30	33	30
Average number of electors per councillor	3,439	3,783	3,424	3,766
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 per cent from the average	20	2	22	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 per cent from the average	11	0	13	0

173 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Liverpool City would result in no ward having an electoral variance of more than 10% either now or by 2006.

**Draft recommendation**

Liverpool City Council should comprise 90 councillors serving 30 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: Draft recommendations for Liverpool City*



## 5 WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

174 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Liverpool contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 28 October 2002. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the City Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

175 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

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



## APPENDIX A

### **Draft recommendations for Liverpool City: detailed mapping**

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

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

Three **large maps** illustrate the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Liverpool City.

*Map A1: Draft recommendations for Liverpool City: key map*

## APPENDIX B

### Code of Practice on Written Consultation

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

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

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

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