

Draft recommendations on
the future electoral
arrangements for Bradford

February 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.

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?	39
Appendix	
A Draft recommendations for Bradford: Detailed mapping	41
B Code of Practice on Written Consultation	43

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 Boundary Committee for England began a review of the electoral arrangements for Bradford on 8 May 2002.

- **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 Bradford:

- **in 11 of the 30 wards the number of electors represented by each councillor varies by more than 10% from the average for the district and one ward varies 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 14 wards and by more than 20% in three wards.**

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

- **Bradford District Council should have 90 councillors, the same as at present;**
- **there should be 30 wards, the same as at present;**
- **the boundaries of all 30 of the existing wards should be modified.**

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

- **In 29 of the proposed 30 wards the number of electors per councillor would vary by no more than 10% from the district average;**
- **this improved level of electoral equality is forecast to continue, with the number of electors per councillor in 29 wards expected to vary by no more than 10% from the district average in 2006.**

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

- **revised warding arrangements and the redistribution of councillors for the parish of Ilkley;**
- **revised warding arrangements for the parish of Keighley.**

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

- **We will consult on these proposals for eight weeks from 11 February 2003. 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 7 April 2003:

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

Table 1: Draft recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large maps reference
1	Baildon	3	Part of Baildon ward; part of Idle ward	4 and 5
2	Bingley	3	Part of Bingley ward; part of Rombalds ward	2, 4 and 5
3	Bingley Rural	3	Part of Bingley ward; part of Bingley Rural ward; Cullingworth parish	3, 4 and 6
4	Bolton & Undercliffe	3	Part of Bolton ward; part of Eccleshill ward; part of Undercliffe ward	5
5	Bowling & Barkerend	3	Part of Bowling ward; part of Little Horton ward; part of Undercliffe ward	5 and 8
6	Bradford Moor	3	Bradford Moor ward; part of Bowling ward	5 and 8
7	City	3	Part of Little Horton ward; part of Undercliffe ward; part of University ward	4, 5, 7 and 8
8	Clayton	3	Clayton ward; part of Great Horton ward; part of Queensbury ward; part of Thornton ward	4 and 7
9	Craven	3	Silsden parish; Steeton with Eastburn parish	1, 2 and 3
10	Eccleshill	3	Part of Eccleshill ward; part of Idle ward; part of Undercliffe ward	5
11	Great Horton	3	Part of Great Horton ward; part of Queensbury ward; part of Wibsey ward	7
12	Heaton	3	Part of Bingley Rural ward; part of Heaton ward; part of Shipley West ward; part of Toller ward	4 and 5
13	Idle	3	Part of Idle ward	5
14	Ilkley & Addingham	3	Addingham parish; part of Ilkley parish (the proposed North, South and West parish wards)	1 and 2
15	Keighley Central	3	Part of Keighley parish (the proposed Highfield, Knowle Park, Lawkholme & Showfield, Spring Gardens & Utley and Town parish wards)	1, 3 and 4
16	Keighley East	3	Part of Keighley parish (the proposed Long Lee & Parkwood, Morton & Sandbeds, Riddlesden & Stockbridge and Woodhouse & Hainworth parish wards)	1, 2, 3 and 4
17	Keighley West	3	Part of Keighley parish (the proposed Bogthorn & Exley, Brackenbank & Ingrow, Fell Lane & Westburn, Guardhouse and Laycock & Braithwaite parish wards)	3
18	Little Horton	3	Part of Bowling ward; part of Little Horton ward; part of Odsal ward	7 and 8

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large maps reference
19	Manningham	3	Part of Heaton ward; part of Toller ward; part of Undercliffe ward; part of University ward	5
20	Queensbury	3	Part of Queensbury ward; part of Thornton ward;	7
21	Royds	3	Part of Odsal ward; part of Queensbury ward; part of Wibsey ward; part of Wyke ward	7
22	Shipley East	3	Part of Bolton ward; part of Idle ward; part of Shipley East ward	5
23	Shipley West	3	Part of Baildon ward; part of Bingley ward; part of Bingley Rural ward; part of Shipley East ward; part of Shipley West ward	4 and 5
24	Thornton	3	Denholme parish; part of Thornton ward	4, 6 and 7
25	Toller	3	Part of Heaton ward; part of Toller ward	4 and 5
26	Tong	3	Tong ward; part of Bowling ward	8
27	Wharfedale	3	Part of Ilkley parish (the proposed Ben Rhydding, Burley and Menston parish wards)	2
28	Wibsey	3	Part of Odsal ward; part of Wibsey ward	7 and 8
29	Worth Valley	3	Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury parish; part of Keighley parish (Oakworth parish ward); Oxenhope parish	3 and 6
30	Wyke	3	Part of Odsal ward; part of Wyke ward	7 and 8

Notes:

- 1) *The wards on the above table are illustrated on Map 2 and the large maps.*
- 2) *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 Bradford

	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	Baildon	3	11,291	3,764	1	11,560	3,853	2
2	Bingley	3	11,393	3,798	2	11,574	3,858	2
3	Bingley Rural	3	11,823	3,941	5	12,149	4,050	7
4	Bolton & Undercliffe	3	11,360	3,787	1	11,565	3,855	2
5	Bowling & Barkerend	3	11,869	3,956	6	11,846	3,949	4
6	Bradford Moor	3	11,158	3,719	0	11,418	3,806	0
7	City	3	11,634	3,878	4	11,970	3,990	5
8	Clayton	3	10,939	3,646	-2	11,379	3,793	0
9	Craven	3	9,658	3,219	-14	9,824	3,275	-14
10	Eccleshill	3	11,803	3,934	5	11,578	3,859	2
11	Great Horton	3	11,122	3,707	-1	11,294	3,765	-1
12	Heaton	3	12,024	4,008	7	12,120	4,040	7
13	Idle	3	11,276	3,759	1	11,661	3,887	3
14	Ilkley & Addingham	3	12,033	4,011	7	12,203	4,068	7
15	Keighley Central	3	10,997	3,666	-2	11,002	3,667	-3
16	Keighley East	3	11,015	3,672	-2	11,153	3,718	-2
17	Keighley West	3	11,078	3,693	-1	11,121	3,707	-2
18	Little Horton	3	10,916	3,639	-3	10,792	3,597	-5
19	Manningham	3	10,911	3,637	-3	11,062	3,687	-3
20	Queensbury	3	10,647	3,549	-5	11,043	3,681	-3
21	Royds	3	10,744	3,581	-4	10,869	3,623	-4
22	Shipley East	3	10,974	3,658	-2	11,051	3,684	-3
23	Shipley West	3	11,552	3,851	3	11,722	3,907	3
24	Thornton	3	11,589	3,863	3	11,551	3,850	2
25	Toller	3	11,078	3,693	-1	11,443	3,814	1

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 %
26 Tong	3	11,854	3,951	6	11,738	3,913	3
27 Wharfedale	3	11,050	3,683	-1	11,521	3,840	1
28 Wibsey	3	11,061	3,687	-1	11,045	3,682	-3
29 Worth Valley	3	10,321	3,440	-8	10,628	3,543	-6
30 Wyke	3	11,115	3,705	-1	10,970	3,657	-3
Totals	90	336,285	-	-	340,852	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,737	-	-	3,787	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Bradford Metropolitan District 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 district. 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 metropolitan district of Bradford, on which we are now consulting. We are reviewing the five metropolitan districts in West Yorkshire 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 Bradford. Bradford's last review was carried out by the Local Government Boundary Commission, which reported to the Secretary of State in June 1979 (Report no. 337).

3 In carrying out these 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;
 - reflect the identities and interests of local communities;
 - secure effective and convenient local government; and
 - achieve equality of representation;
- Schedule 11 to the Local Government Act 1972.

4 Details of the legislation under which the review of Bradford is being conducted are set out in a document entitled *Guidance and Procedural Advice for Periodic Electoral Reviews* (Published by the EC in July 2002). 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 district.

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

7 We are not prescriptive on council size. However, we believe that any proposals relating to council size, whether these are for an increase, a reduction or no change, should be supported by evidence and argumentation. Given the stage now reached in the introduction of new political management structures under the provisions of the Local Government Act 2000, it is important that whatever council size interested parties may propose to us, they can demonstrate that their proposals have been fully thought through, and have been developed in the context of a review of internal political management and the role of councillors in the new structure. However, we have found it necessary to safeguard against upward drift in the number of councillors, and we believe that any proposal for an increase in council size will need to be fully justified. In particular, we do not accept that an increase in electorate should automatically result in an increase in the number of councillors, 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 district ward. However, the figure must be divisible by three. In practice, all metropolitan district 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 8 May 2002, when we wrote to Bradford Metropolitan District Council inviting proposals for future electoral arrangements. We also notified West Yorkshire Police Authority, the Local Government Association, Yorkshire Local Councils Association, parish and town councils in the district, Members of Parliament with constituency interests in the district, Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire and the Humber Region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited Bradford Metropolitan District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 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 11 February 2003 and will end on 7 April 2003, 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 metropolitan district of Bradford stretches over Airedale, Wharfedale and the Worth Valley, and includes the towns of Shipley, Bingley, Keighley, Ilkley and the City of Bradford. It has a population of 483,731 and covers an area of 36,635 hectares. The district is one of the largest single-tier local authorities in terms of population and size of geographical area covered. Although the Industrial Revolution transformed Bradford from a rural market town to an international trading centre, over 70% of the district today is green open space. Bradford is well known for its good range of houses and industrial buildings, and is a centre for printing, packaging, mail order distribution, high technology and tourism with a lively cultural scene.

15 The district currently contains nine parishes, covering the north and west parts of the district. The remainder of the district is unparished. Bradford city comprises approximately 37% of the district's total electorate.

16 The electorate of the district is 336,285 (December 2001). The Council presently has 90 members who are elected from 30 wards, 11 of which cover Bradford city with the remainder being predominantly rural. All wards are three-member wards.

17 At present, each councillor represents an average of 3,737 electors, which the District Council forecasts will increase to 3,787 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 11 of the 30 wards varies by more than 10% from the district average, one ward by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in University ward, where each councillor represents 25% more electors than the district average.

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

Map 1: Existing wards in Bradford

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	Baildon	3	12,328	4,109	10	12,616	4,205	11
2	Bingley	3	10,684	3,561	-5	10,920	3,640	-4
3	Bingley Rural	3	11,887	3,962	6	12,098	4,033	6
4	Bolton	3	10,233	3,411	-9	10,547	3,516	-7
5	Bowling	3	11,891	3,964	6	11,887	3,962	5
6	Bradford Moor	3	10,663	3,554	-5	10,925	3,642	-4
7	Clayton	3	10,286	3,429	-8	10,723	3,574	-6
8	Craven	3	12,613	4,204	13	12,844	4,281	13
9	Eccleshill	3	9,340	3,113	-17	9,126	3,042	-20
10	Great Horton	3	10,958	3,653	-2	11,122	3,707	-2
11	Heaton	3	12,028	4,009	7	12,073	4,024	6
12	Idle	3	12,415	4,138	11	12,821	4,274	13
13	Ilkley	3	11,161	3,720	0	11,279	3,760	-1
14	Keighley North	3	11,004	3,668	-2	11,150	3,717	-2
15	Keighley South	3	9,004	3,001	-20	8,981	2,994	-21
16	Keighley West	3	11,410	3,803	2	11,423	3,808	1
17	Little Horton	3	10,170	3,390	-9	10,024	3,341	-12
18	Odsal	3	11,902	3,967	6	11,914	3,971	5
19	Queensbury	3	13,316	4,439	19	13,782	4,594	21
20	Rombalds	3	12,832	4,277	14	13,431	4,477	18
21	Shipley East	3	9,783	3,261	-13	9,847	3,282	-13
22	Shipley West	3	11,570	3,857	3	11,711	3,904	3
23	Thornton	3	9,584	3,195	-15	9,460	3,153	-17
24	Toller	3	12,025	4,008	7	12,427	4,142	9

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 %
25 Tong	3	9,475	3,158	-15	9,356	3,119	-18
26 Undercliffe	3	10,109	3,370	-10	10,043	3,348	-12
27 University	3	13,985	4,662	25	14,435	4,812	27
28 Wibsey	3	9,953	3,318	-11	10,040	3,347	-12
29 Worth Valley	3	11,993	3,998	7	12,350	4,117	9
30 Wyke	3	11,683	3,894	4	11,497	3,832	1
Totals	90	336,285	-	-	340,852	-	-
Averages	-	-	3,737	-	-	3,787	-

Source: *Electorate figures are based on information provided by Bradford Metropolitan District 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. For example, in 2001, electors in Keighley South ward were relatively over-represented by 20%, while electors in University ward were relatively under-represented by 25%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.*

3 Submissions received

19 At the start of the review members of the public and other interested parties were invited to write to us giving their views on the future electoral arrangements for Bradford Metropolitan District Council and its constituent parish and town councils.

20 During this initial stage of the review, officers from The Boundary Committee visited the area and met officers and members from the District Council. We received 13 representations during Stage One, all of which may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council.

Bradford Council Conservative Group

21 Bradford Council Conservative Group (hereafter referred to as the Conservatives) put forward a district-wide submission, which was endorsed by five other local Conservative Associations. They proposed no change to the numbers of councillors and wards as “the present numbers serve the district well and provide effective representation.” They proposed boundary amendments in Keighley town and the creation of a new ward in the south of Bradford city. No changes were proposed for Bradford Moor, Craven and Ilkley wards. However, minor changes were made to the remaining wards.

Bradford Council Liberal Democrats Group

22 Bradford Council Liberal Democrats Group (hereafter referred to as the Liberal Democrats) also put forward a district-wide submission which proposed retaining the existing council size and number of wards. In the main, they “re-arranged existing polling districts as far as possible, and corrected some minor anomalies”, particularly in the north of the district and in the centre of Bradford city, to give better electoral equality. Only Bradford Moor and Worth Valley wards remained unchanged under their proposals.

Parish and town councils

23 Representations were received from one town council and one parish council. Keighley Town Council argued that large wards of three councillors is “not necessarily the best model for the Keighley area” and requested a full structural review. It opposed the changes proposed by Bradford Metropolitan District Council’s consultation scheme to Craven, Keighley North and Worth Valley wards and put forward its own changes to nine wards, including renaming seven wards.

24 Ilkley Parish Council proposed retaining the current electoral arrangements for Ilkley ward as it “has a clearly defined boundary” with “the correct average number of electors for district council representation”. It argued that there is no need to change the boundaries of the parish wards which lie within the existing Rombalds ward “as they cover clearly defined communities”.

Other representations

25 A further nine representations were received from local groups and local residents. Burley Community Council and Menston Community Association commented on the warding arrangements of Ilkley parish. Menston Community Association proposed transferring Micklethwaite and Crossflatts into Keighley North ward if “numbers became an imperative”.

26 A petition with 175 signatures was received, which proposed that the Crossflatts and Micklethwaite area be “incorporated” into Bingley ward. Three other representations were also received, including another petition with 313 signatures, arguing that Crossflatts should not be

included in Keighley North ward but should be placed within Bingley ward. One resident proposed that Ilkley ward “should remain with its clear boundary as indicated by the ‘Green Belt’ area”. Two residents objected to the Beechcliffe area being transferred to Keighley North ward. They argued that the “area is a natural part of the parish of Utley”, which is situated in Keighley West ward.

27 West Yorkshire Police Authority argued that any changes to ward boundaries “should be kept to a minimum”.

Bradford Metropolitan District Council

28 In order to seek the views of local people on the electoral review, the Council’s Executive approved the publication of a consultation submission to illustrate how a 30 ward, 90 member scheme might look. However, due to lack of cross-party agreement, the Council at its meeting on 16 July 2002 made it explicit that this illustrative scheme should be “withdrawn in its entirety.”

29 The District Council’s consultation scheme proposed a number of changes to improve electoral equality. The Council proposed using the main railway line, which runs north to south from Leeds to Halifax through the Bradford urban area, as a boundary for city wards. It proposed the creation of an additional ward to the west of Bradford city centre and the deletion of a ward in east Bradford. There were also a number of other less substantial boundary changes in all Bradford city wards, with only Wyke ward remaining unchanged.

4 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

31 As described earlier, the prime aim in considering the most appropriate electoral arrangements for Bradford 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 a 3% increase in the electorate of the Bradford district. However, between 1994 and 2001 there has been no substantial growth overall. Development arising from regeneration has resulted in a shift of electors towards the regenerated areas, with the knock-on effect of many wards being substantially under-represented. Baildon, Craven, Idle and Queensbury wards have seen their electorate rise with the building of new estates of residential properties. The demolition of public sector housing on other estates has seen wards lose electorate, notably, Eccleshill, Thornton and Tong wards. There has also been significant population growth in inner-city wards in Bradford, most notably in University ward. The District Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2006, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 1% from 336,285 to 340,852 over the five-year period from 2001 to 2006. It expects most of the growth to be in Rombalds ward, although a significant amount is also expected in Queensbury ward. 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 District 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 District Council's figures, accept that they are the best estimates that can reasonably be made at this time.

Council size

37 Bradford District Council presently has 90 members representing 30 wards.

38 The Conservatives, in their original submission, argued that the "present numbers serve the district well and provide effective representation." They stated that any reduction in the number of councillors would only serve to increase the workload for councillors, and an increase was not justified by the fact that the district's electorate has risen since 1974. The Liberal Democrats also supported retaining the current council size of 90 members. This was because they "have not found that the new constitution has greatly reduced our members' role on the council and the casework load continues to grow."

39 Both the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats were asked to provide further evidence and argumentation supporting a council size of 90 members representing 30 wards. The Conservatives subsequently argued five main points to justify retaining the current number of councillors. Their first point was that "any reduction in the number of councillors will result in a loss of representation for communities." Also, they stated that new technologies have increased the ability for the public to contact councillors; increasing the work-load for most ward members. Therefore, increasing the size of the wards would "add significantly to individual workloads" which would, in turn, have an impact on the level of service provided. They stated that councillor involvement in local communities and providing good representation on external bodies should also be taken into account. The Conservatives' final point was that "reducing the numbers of councillors would make it more difficult for political groups to arrange the business of the council without members being expected to 'double up' on senior positions". They concluded that any reduction in the number of councillors would increase the strain on existing members and reduce the effectiveness of local government. They stated that, although the population is expected to grow, "this increase does not justify any increase in the number of councillors."

40 In their further submission, the Liberal Democrats stated that "reducing the number of wards would increase the work of councillors and perhaps most serious of all, might cause some communities to feel that they are not properly represented." They also stated that, unlike most metropolitan authorities, the population of the district has not fallen over the past 25 years and so there is no requirement to reduce the number of councillors to reflect a fall in electorate. Also, "the consequence of a reduction in the number of councillors would be either a further increase in workload or a reduction in the level and quality of service to residents." The Liberal Democrats were also concerned that it would restrict the role of councillors only to those not in employment or without family responsibilities, and that the currently lower than average age profile of councillors would change.

41 The District Council's consultation scheme (which it later withdrew) was based on a council of 90 members, the same as at present, serving 30 wards. It considered a reduction in the number of councillors would be likely to lead to "a further increase in workload" or "a reduction in the level of services available to residents". The Council argued that "90 members allow members to provide a good level of casework support to residents" and spend an appropriate amount of time on overview and scrutiny, area committees and planning as well as to represent the interests of residents and the authority on a number of outside bodies. Also, it stated that a reduction in the number of wards would make the current structure of geographically large rural wards and the small urban wards even more pronounced and increase councillors' difficulties in travelling around their areas, which equates to additional time.

42 We carefully considered all the comments received at Stage One concerning council size. We have not been persuaded by any of the arguments put to us by the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats during Stage One that the issue of council size has been considered by them

as thoroughly as we would wish. In particular, we received no evidence that the new internal political management structure of Bradford Metropolitan District Council had been taken into consideration in either submission. Although both submissions had briefly discussed the representational roles of councillors, there was no discussion of the role of councillors within the new political management structure. It should be noted that it has been difficult for us to acquire the necessary evidence during Stage One, as Bradford Metropolitan District Council decided not to submit a scheme. However, we noted that a 90 member council had been consulted on during Stage One by the District Council and, as far as we are aware, there was no opposition to this council size. We also note that the retention of the existing council size received cross-party consensus, and that it provides for the correct allocation of councillors between the urban and rural parts of the district. Having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we conclude that at this stage we should base our draft recommendations on a council of 90 members. However, we would welcome comments from local people at Stage Three.

Electoral arrangements

43 We have some concerns over the extent to which the political groups represented on Bradford council have engaged with the issues raised by this review. In addition to the lack of persuasive evidence relating to council size, as discussed above, we found difficulties in the development of draft recommendations due to a lack of evidence and argumentation relating to community identities and interests in the area. We would welcome further information on such matters during Stage Three of the review.

44 However, having carefully considered all the representations received at Stage One and having visited the area, we propose basing our draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' scheme in the north of the district, as we consider their proposals to offer the most suitable warding arrangement for the area and to offer good levels of electoral equality. We have modified these proposals to tie ward boundaries to better ground detail.

45 In Keighley and Bradford city, we propose basing our draft recommendations on the Conservatives' submission, as it provides for good electoral equality and groups similar communities together in single wards. However, we have put forward a number of our own proposals and amendments across the district to further improve electoral equality, place similar communities in single wards and to tie boundaries to better ground detail.

46 In Bradford city, where possible, we have decided to utilize the railway line which runs north to south from Leeds to Halifax as a strong boundary through the centre of Bradford urban area. Neither the Liberal Democrats nor the Conservatives made use of what we feel to be one of the strongest boundaries in the city and so, although we are broadly basing our draft recommendations for this area on the Conservatives' proposals, we have moved away from them in a number of places. We noted the fact that the Council's illustrative consultation scheme did make use of this railway line.

47 We consider that a combination of the two district-wide schemes received would provide a better balance between electoral equality and the statutory criteria than the current arrangements and we were able to reflect the views of a number of respondents who wrote to us at Stage One. However, to improve electoral equality further and having regard to local community identities and interests, we have decided to move away from the proposals received in a number of areas, including around Bingley town and in the centre of Bradford city. For district warding purposes, the following areas, based on existing wards, are considered in turn:

- a) Craven, Ilkley, Keighley North, Keighley South, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards.
- b) Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural, Rombalds, Shipley East and Shipley West wards.
- c) Clayton, Great Horton, Heaton, Little Horton, Odsal, Queensbury, Thornton, Toller, University, Wibsey and Wyke wards.
- d) Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Idle, Tong and Undercliffe wards.

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

Craven, Ilkley, Keighley North, Keighley South, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards

49 The existing Craven (comprising the parishes of Addingham, Silsden and Steeton with Eastburn), Ilkley (comprising part of Ilkley parish), Keighley North (comprising part of Keighley parish), Keighley South (comprising part of Keighley parish), Keighley West (comprising part of Keighley parish) and Worth Valley wards (comprising the parishes of Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury and Oxenhope, and part of Keighley parish) are situated to the north and west of the district. Under the current council size of 90, the number of electors per councillor in Craven, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards are 13%, 2% and 7% above the district average respectively (13%, 1% and 9% above the district average by 2006). Ilkley ward is equal to the district average and the wards of Keighley North and Keighley South are 2% and 20% below the district average respectively (1%, 2% and 21% below the district average by 2006).

50 The Conservatives proposed to retain the existing Craven and Ilkley wards. Their proposed Keighley East ward would consist predominantly of the existing Keighley North ward, taking in the communities of East Morton, Long Lee, Riddlesden and Thwaites Brow. They proposed transferring the Keighley Town Council ward of Hainworth & Woodhouse into the proposed Keighley East ward. The River Worth and River Aire would form the boundary between all three of the proposed Keighley wards. The proposed Keighley Central ward would encompass parts of all three current Keighley wards, and would cover the town centre and northern part of Keighley. It would include the Beechcliffe, Highfield and Spring Gardens and Utley areas from the current Keighley West ward, the Lawkholme and Showfield areas from Keighley North ward and the Knowle Park area and town centre from Keighley South ward. The proposed Keighley West ward would now encompass parts of Keighley South ward, the Bracken Bank and Ingrow areas, Keighley West ward, the Braithwaite, Fell Lane, Guardhouse and Laycock areas, and Worth Valley ward, the Bogthorn and Exley Head areas. The proposed Worth Valley ward would consist of the existing ward with one amendment to its north-east boundary; the Bogthorn and Exley Head area being transferred to the proposed Keighley West ward.

51 The Liberal Democrats stated that Craven ward is substantially oversized at present and proposed removing the parish of Addingham, but adding the Riddlesden and Stockbridge areas (polling districts 14A and 14J). The Liberal Democrats proposed transferring that part of Ilkley ward to the east of Ilkley town, Ben Rhydding parish ward, into a new Wharfedale ward. The remainder of the existing Ilkley ward would then be included in a new Ilkley & Addingham ward with Addingham parish. Under the Liberal Democrats' scheme, Worth Valley ward would remain unchanged. In relation to their proposed Keighley East and Keighley West wards, they stated that the way the Town Council had been created "severely limits the options in Keighley." The Liberal Democrats proposed a new Cullingworth & Morton ward, which would cover the rural area between Bingley and Keighley across the Aire Valley and include the villages of Cullingworth and Harden.

52 Ilkley Parish Council argued that the existing Ilkley ward has a "clearly defined boundary and is the most obviously defined, cohesive area in the Bradford metropolitan district." It also stated that it contains the correct number of electors for district council representation and so no changes are necessary.

53 Keighley Town Council objected to the District Council's consultation scheme for the area. In Craven ward, it proposed that the Beechcliffe and Utley areas (polling districts 16A and 16B) be transferred from Keighley West ward to "strengthen electoral figures". It suggested that Addingham parish be placed within Ilkley ward, which would be renamed Ilkley West, and that the boundary between Craven ward and Keighley North ward should take the line of Clough Beck. The proposed ward should be renamed Craven & North Keighley ward. Keighley Town Council also pointed out that moving Crossflatts to Keighley North ward would "provoke opposition from that area as it is historically and traditionally part of Bingley." It proposed that a more sensible boundary would be that of Morton Beck from where it goes under the Canal to the River Aire. Keighley North ward would include areas from the existing Keighley West ward and central areas from Keighley South ward while the Long Lee, Morton and Riddlesden areas would be transferred to Keighley South ward. Keighley North ward would also be renamed Keighley Central ward. Keighley Town Council also objected to the District Council's proposals for Worth Valley ward, stating instead that the ward should gain Cullingworth and Denholme parishes from Bingley Rural ward; producing a ward of four rural parishes with "common interests" to be renamed Keighley Rural ward. The Bogthorn, Exley Head, Oakworth and Oldfield areas would be transferred to Keighley West ward. Changes would be made to Keighley South and Keighley West wards, the former of which would be renamed Keighley East ward. The proposed Keighley West ward would cover areas from Worth Valley and Keighley South wards, and areas would be transferred to Craven and Keighley North wards as previously discussed. The proposed Keighley East ward would gain the Long Lee, Morton and Riddlesden areas from Keighley North ward and part of the Crossflatts area from the existing Rombalds ward. The central Keighley areas would be included in the proposed Keighley Central ward, the Bracken Bank and Exley areas in Keighley West ward and the Knowle Park area shared between Keighley Central and Keighley West wards.

54 We received a submission from a local resident, which argued that Ilkley ward "should remain with its clear boundary as indicated by the 'Green Belt' area."

55 We received one additional submission from two local residents objecting to Beechcliffe being transferred to Keighley North ward. It argued that the "area is a natural part of the parish of Utley", which remains in Keighley West ward.

56 In its consultation scheme, which was later withdrawn, Bradford Metropolitan District Council proposed a number of boundary changes in this area, with the exception of Ilkley ward, which it proposed should remain unchanged. It proposed extending the combined Keighley urban wards further down the Aire valley towards Bingley to include the Crossflatts and Micklethwaite areas, currently situated in Rombalds ward. This would result in the significant redrawing of the boundaries between the three Keighley wards to redistribute the additional electorate included from Crossflatts and Micklethwaite. Finally, it proposed minor adjustments between the three Keighley wards and the surrounding wards, preserving the natural community boundaries of the rural communities in the area.

57 After careful consideration of all representations received during Stage One, we have decided to broadly adopt the Liberal Democrats' proposals for the north of the district and the Conservatives' proposals for the Keighley area. Consequently, we propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' Ilkley & Addingham ward, with one amendment. This amendment would be to the boundary between the Liberal Democrats' proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards. Our proposed boundary would follow the railway line through Ilkley town from Ilkley to Bradford or Leeds, go down Cowpasture Road, go around Craiglands Road and then follow Backstone Beck to the boundary with the existing Rombalds ward. We consider this amendment to provide for stronger boundaries than originally proposed and also to improve electoral equality. We also propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward, with this amendment. Both Ilkley town and the proposed Wharfedale ward are currently situated in the parish of Ilkley and we concur with the proposal to include part of Ilkley town in Wharfedale ward to improve electoral equality. We investigated other possible warding arrangements in this area, including

having an Ilkley ward as proposed by Ilkley Parish Council, but found that this resulted in a relatively high level of electoral inequality in Rombalds and Craven wards. As we have received a locally generated scheme which resolves this electoral variance, we are content to base our draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards. We propose adopting the name Ilkley & Addingham ward, rather than Ilkley West as proposed by Keighley Town Council, as the proposed ward includes most of Ilkley town and Addingham parish.

58 Craven ward would consist of Silsden parish and Steeton with Eastburn parish and would be over-represented by 14% by 2006. However, as it lies on the edge of the district and is a rural area, there is little scope to address the imbalance without transferring an area out of Keighley, which is in a separate parish with few links to the area. We consider the Conservatives' proposals better meet the statutory criteria in this area than the Liberal Democrats' proposals as the latter proposed including part of the existing Keighley North ward in their proposed Craven ward, which would divide established communities and offers a poor link between the two areas.

59 We decided to adopt the Conservatives' Worth Valley ward as it best reflects community identity by grouping the south-western rural area in a single ward. The Conservatives also proposed three new wards in Keighley; Keighley East, Keighley Central and Keighley West. These proposed wards would offer good levels of electoral equality and appear to respect community identity. We are therefore content to endorse them as part of our draft recommendations. However, we propose two amendments to the proposed Keighley Central ward; that its eastern boundary with Keighley East ward should follow Bradford Road and that its southern boundary with Keighley West ward should go in front of the houses along Rawling Street and Grafton Road. This is to tie ward boundaries to better ground detail and group similar communities in single wards respectively. We consider the Conservatives' proposals better meet the statutory criteria than the Liberal Democrats' for the Keighley area as they contain Keighley town within three wards offering good electoral equality. We consider the Liberal Democrats' scheme most improves the warding arrangements in the Ilkley area as they address the anomalies of the existing Rombalds ward, as discussed later, and improve electoral equality. As a result of our draft recommendations, we are recommending modifications to the warding arrangements of Ilkley and Keighley parishes, as discussed later in the chapter.

60 Under our draft recommendations, Craven, Keighley Central, Keighley East, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards would have electoral variances 14%, 2%, 2%, 1% and 8% below the district average respectively (14%, 3%, 2%, 2% and 6% below by 2006). The number of electors per councillor for Ilkley & Addingham ward would be 7% above the district average, both initially and by 2006.

Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural, Rombalds, Shipley East and Shipley West wards

61 The existing Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural (comprising Cullingworth parish and Denholme parish), Rombalds (comprising part of Ilkley parish), Shipley East and Shipley West wards cover the Shipley area in the centre of the district. In May 2003 a further parish, Wilsden, will come into existence in Bingley Rural ward. The number of electors per councillor for the wards of Baildon, Bingley Rural, Rombalds and Shipley West are currently 10%, 6%, 14% and 3% above the district average respectively (11%, 6%, 18% and 3% above by 2006). Bingley and Shipley East wards have electoral variances 5% and 13% below the district average (4% and 13% below by 2006).

62 The Conservatives' proposed Baildon ward would include the village of Esholt from the existing Idle ward as "there is no direct link between Esholt and Idle with the River Aire forming a natural boundary." The area at Low Springs would be transferred from the existing Rombalds

ward to the proposed Baildon ward and the area adjacent to Coach Road, the area of Baildon Holmes and Dockfield industrial park, would be transferred from the existing Baildon ward to the proposed Shipley East ward; the natural community of Baildon remaining unaffected by these proposals. The Conservatives also proposed changes to the existing Rombalds ward – the Low Springs area would be transferred to Baildon ward and west Eldwick and the area adjacent to Lady Lane would be transferred to Bingley ward.

63 The Conservatives proposed transferring the area around Higher Coach Road out of Bingley ward and adding part of the existing Bingley Rural ward, Bradford Road from Beckfoot to Cottingley Bar, and Rombalds ward, part of west Eldwick and the area adjacent to Lady Lane. The only proposed change to Bingley Rural ward would be around the Cottingley area, as detailed earlier, resulting in a slightly over-represented ward initially. The expected housing development in the ward would give an acceptable electoral variance by 2006.

64 The changes proposed by the Conservatives to Shipley East ward would include the transfer of Coach Road from the existing Baildon ward, as the access to this area is good from the current Shipley East ward. The Frizinghall area would be added from Shipley West ward and the part of Saltaire currently within Shipley East ward would be transferred to the proposed Shipley West ward. Further changes to Shipley West ward would involve the transfer of Lower Heaton to the proposed Heaton ward, the boundary would run to the north of Aireville Road and Aireville Crescent, and the addition of the Nab Wood area from Bingley Rural ward.

65 The Liberal Democrats proposed transferring the Lucy Hall area (part of polling district 1A) from Baildon ward to their proposed Bingley ward. The central area of Bingley town would be preserved in one ward with the addition of the adjoining community of Eldwick to the north. In Bingley Rural ward, the area of Sandy Lane (polling district 11A) would be included in a ward with the communities of Cottingley, Denholme, Harecroft and Wilsden. The proposed Cullingworth & Morton ward would cover the rural area between Bingley and Keighley across Aire Valley and include the villages of Cullingworth and Harden.

66 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new ward, Wharfedale, made up of the north section of the old Rombalds ward and the Ben Rhydding area of Ilkley town. The area south of Rombalds Moor (polling districts 20A and 20B) would be placed in the new Bingley and Cullingworth & Morton wards respectively.

67 The Liberal Democrats proposed that the Saltaire and Shipley areas be placed together in Shipley ward, removing the artificial division between the existing Shipley East and West wards. They also proposed another new ward, Wrose, consisting of the Wrose community, Kings Park, Swain House and Windhill.

68 Keighley Town Council's proposed Ilkley East ward would include the Ben Rhydding area from the existing Ilkley ward, but the Eldwick and Crossflatts area (polling districts 20A and 20B) would be transferred to the proposed Bingley ward. Its proposed Bingley ward would be based on the existing ward but Lower Coach Road and Harden village (polling district 2A) would be transferred out of the ward. It proposed a Bingley Outer ward, which would be based on the existing Bingley Rural ward but in addition would include Sandy Lane, Stoney Lane, the village of Harden and the area north of Allerton Road. Three dwellings along Keighley Road would go to the proposed Keighley East ward and Cullingworth and Denholme parishes would be transferred out of the ward into the proposed Keighley Rural ward.

69 Burley Community Council claimed that "Rombalds Ward has always been an artificial concept, not corresponding to any geographical or community boundaries." It argued that Burley and Menston have few connections with Crossflatts, Eldwick or Micklethwaite, the remainder of the existing Rombalds ward, as there are six kilometres of Green Belt between Burley and Eldwick, the nearest of the three. Menston Community Association proposed moving Micklethwaite and Crossflatts into Keighley North ward if "numbers became an imperative."

70 We received two petitions, containing 175 and 313 signatures respectively, proposing that Crossflatts and Micklethwaite be included in Bingley ward, not Keighley North ward. One local resident also stated that Crossflatts should not remain in Rombalds ward.

71 Bradford Metropolitan District Council's consultation scheme proposed extending Bingley Rural ward into the rural areas of West Bradford and extending Shipley East ward into Idle and Bolton wards. It also proposed the substantial redrawing of boundaries in the Shipley urban area, particularly between Shipley East and Shipley West wards, to bring about better levels of electoral equality.

72 We have carefully considered all representations received regarding these wards during Stage One. We propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward, with one amendment, and base our proposals on the Conservatives' submission for the Shipley area with some amendments of our own. The proposed amendment to the Liberal Democrats' Wharfedale ward would be the transfer of the Ben Rhydding area lying south of the railway from Ilkley town, as previously discussed. Both Ilkley town and the proposed Wharfedale ward are currently situated in the parish of Ilkley and we concur with the proposal to include part of Ilkley town in Wharfedale ward to improve electoral equality. We investigated other possible warding arrangements in this area, including having an Ilkley ward as proposed by Ilkley Parish Council, but found that this resulted in a relatively high level of electoral inequality in Rombalds and Craven wards. As we have received a locally generated scheme which resolves this electoral variance, we are content to base our draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward but would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three. The existing Rombalds ward would have a variance of 18% by 2006 and, as described by Burley Community Council, currently does not correspond to any "geographical or community boundaries". The links between the north and south of the existing ward are poor and we consider the Liberal Democrats' proposals to best address this anomaly.

73 Crossflatts, Eldwick and Micklethwaite (polling districts 20A and 20B), south of Rombalds Moor and in the valley of the River Aire, would be transferred to Bingley ward, with which the residents have greater links, as proposed by Keighley Town Council. We propose that the new Bingley ward would include the southern part of Rombalds ward, but the village of Harden plus Harden Moor (polling district 2A) and the small area to the south of the railway (polling district 2J and part of 2K) would be transferred to Bingley Rural ward. The areas to the north and south of Higher Coach Road (polling district 2H) would be transferred to Shipley West ward. In addition to including areas from Bingley ward, we propose that Denholme parish is transferred from Bingley Rural ward to Thornton ward (polling districts 3A and 3B) and Shipley High Moor (polling district 3H) is transferred to Heaton ward. In the light of all submissions received, we consider our proposals for Bingley and Bingley Rural wards to offer the most suitable warding arrangement for this area which best meets the statutory criteria. We propose adopting the Conservatives' proposals for Baildon ward, with two minor modifications to tie boundaries to better ground detail.

74 As mentioned earlier, we propose utilising the railway line as a strong boundary through the Bradford city area and therefore, although we propose basing our draft recommendations for the Shipley area on the Conservatives' submission, we moved away from them in a number of areas. We consider the Conservatives' proposals to best reflect community identities by grouping similar communities together in single wards and have made modifications to follow the Leeds to Halifax railway line, which we consider to be the strongest boundary in the area. In addition to the changes proposed to Shipley West ward by the Conservatives, we propose that Frizinghall is also transferred to Heaton ward to better reflect local communities. Shipley West ward would include that part of Saltaire presently in Shipley East ward and the area adjacent to Higher Coach Road from Bingley ward. Shipley West ward would also include the area around Coach Road and the industrial park from Baildon and Shipley East wards, the boundary following the line of the railway. The proposed Shipley East ward would unite the Wrose area from Bolton ward (polling district 4A and part of 4B) in one ward and we propose taking the

boundary down Cote Farm Lane and then around the back of the houses along the ward boundary with Idle ward to reflect the fact that access is from Shipley East ward. We propose transferring the houses along Valley Road, lying to the east of the railway line, to Heaton ward, to reflect their proximity to this ward rather than to the rest of Shipley East ward. The part of Saltaire currently within Shipley East ward would be transferred to Shipley West ward, uniting the "World Heritage Site" of Saltaire in one ward, as proposed by the Conservatives.

75 Under our draft recommendations, Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural and Shipley West wards would have electoral variances 1%, 2%, 5% and 3% above the district average respectively (2%, 2%, 7% and 3% above by 2006). The number of electors per councillor for Shipley East and Wharfedale wards would be 2% and 1% below the district average respectively (3% below and 1% above by 2006).

Clayton, Great Horton, Heaton, Little Horton, Odsal, Queensbury, Thornton, Toller, University, Wibsey and Wyke wards

76 The existing Clayton, Great Horton, Heaton, Little Horton, Odsal, Queensbury, Thornton, Toller, University, Wibsey and Wyke wards cover the unparished urban area of west Bradford city. Under the current council size of 90 members, the number of electors per councillor for the wards of Heaton, Odsal, Queensbury, Toller, University and Wyke are 7%, 6%, 19%, 7%, 25% and 4% above the district average respectively (6%, 5%, 21%, 9%, 27% and 1% above by 2006). Clayton, Great Horton, Little Horton, Thornton and Wibsey wards have electoral variances 8%, 2%, 9%, 15% and 11% below the district average (6%, 2%, 12%, 17% and 12% below respectively by 2006).

77 The Conservatives' proposed City ward would contain much of the existing University ward. It would include part of the Little Germany and Wapping areas, currently in Undercliffe ward. The proposed Little Horton ward would be based on the existing ward and would unite the Canterbury, Little Horton, Marshfields and West Bowling areas. They also proposed Royds ward, which would draw electors from Odsal, Queensbury, Wibsey and Wyke wards. Their proposed Royds ward comprises the communities of Buttershaw, Delph Hill, Horton Bank and Woodside. The proposed Wibsey ward would include Bankfoot, Haycliffe Hill, Moore Avenue, the Odsal estate and Wibsey High Street. The proposed Wyke ward would be based on the existing ward but would also unite the community of Low Moor and include the Odsal Stadium and adjacent community.

78 The Conservatives proposed minor changes to the existing Clayton ward; the inclusion of Clayton Golf Course and Pasture Lane, and the transfer of the area around Bridge Stile Lane (part of polling district 7D) to Queensbury ward with the boundary now running along the disused railway. They proposed a new Girdlington ward, which is based on the existing Toller ward, but Daisy Hill and parts of the historic township of Heaton would be transferred out of the ward. It would also include the Brown Royd and Lidget Green areas (part of polling districts 27J and 10A). Pasture Lane would be transferred out of the proposed Great Horton ward, but part of the current Queensbury ward would be included. The proposals for Queensbury ward would remove much of the Horton Bank area and the part of Buttershaw that falls within Queensbury ward. In addition, the new ward would include the rural areas west of Clayton and Thornton. The Conservatives proposed a new Thornton ward, based on the existing ward, to include Chellow Dene and Daisy Hill. The area around Clews Moor and West Scholes (polling district 23G) would then transfer into Queensbury ward. The proposed Heaton ward would also be based on the existing ward and include both parts of the historic township that currently lie in Toller and Shipley West wards, and the areas of Stoney Ridge and North Bank Road. The Manningham area would be transferred out of Heaton ward into the proposed Manningham ward.

79 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Heaton & Bolton Woods ward, to the south of Shipley, would combine the communities of Bolton Woods/Owlet, Frizinghall and Heaton. The area adjacent to Whetley Lane (part of polling district 24E) would be transferred out of Toller ward into the new City ward. The proposed Wibsey ward would include part of Buttershaw (polling district 19H) from Queensbury ward and a section of Oakenshaw would be removed from Wyke ward and placed in Tong ward. The proposed Thornton & Allerton ward would be extended to include the Allerton and Lower Grange areas (polling districts 7A and 7B) from Clayton ward. The proposed Clayton ward would include Scholemoor (polling districts 10A and 10B) from Great Horton ward. Marshfields would be united in a new Odsal ward. The proposed Little Horton ward would include West Bowling (18A and 18B) from Odsal ward. The area adjacent to Mandale Road (polling district 19H) would be transferred from Queensbury ward to Wibsey ward and the Horton Bank area (part of polling district 19J) would be transferred to Great Horton ward. The proposed Queensbury ward would include Mountain and West Scholes from Thornton ward (polling district 23G). They also proposed a new City ward, created around the city centre "to solve the problem of a substantially oversized University ward."

80 In its consultation scheme, Bradford Metropolitan District Council proposed the creation of an additional ward in the west of Bradford city. This was created by dividing the existing University ward into two wards, City ward and Manningham ward, and then reallocating some of the surrounding inner city wards into these wards. Other less substantial boundary changes were proposed in all West Bradford wards to bring about electoral equality while as far as possible following natural community boundaries; only Wyke ward was left unchanged.

81 Having carefully considered all submissions received during Stage One we propose broadly adopting the Conservatives' proposals for the western urban area as we consider they utilise strong boundaries and offer good electoral equality. However, we have made a number of amendments to the Conservatives' proposals in order to reflect the fact that we are utilizing the railway line as a boundary. The major change to the proposed Heaton ward would be the transfer of the Manningham area (polling district 11G and part of 11F) to the new Manningham ward, to be discussed in the next section. There would also be the addition of the Frizinghall area and the hospital and Bootham Park area would be transferred into the ward. Shipley High Moor (polling district 3H and part of 3G) would also be included in the proposed Heaton ward. The hospital and Bootham Park would be transferred from Toller ward into the proposed Heaton ward. The proposed Toller ward would include the Parkside Grove and the sports ground (part of polling district 11F) from Heaton ward to better reflect community identity. The area adjacent to Walker Drive (part of polling district 24E) would be transferred to the proposed Manningham ward to improve electoral equality. As we have departed from the Conservatives' proposals for this ward, we do not consider it appropriate to rename the ward Girdlington as they proposed but suggest retaining the name Toller, which we consider to better reflect the local area. However, we would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three.

82 We have made four amendments to the Conservatives' City ward, which is centred on the city centre of Bradford and provides for good levels of electoral equality, to utilise stronger boundaries. The new ward would contain much of the existing University ward and part of Undercliffe ward, the areas of Little Germany and Wapping, using the A650 road as a boundary. City ward would also include the area west of Manchester Road, above the Holme Top area, from Little Horton ward (polling district 17A and part of 17B). The Pasture Lane area would be transferred from Great Horton ward to the new Clayton ward, and the proposed Great Horton ward would include part of Queensbury ward, the area of Horton Bank north of the A647 road (Great Horton Road). It would also include the Haycliffe School from Wibsey ward, to tie the ward boundary to ground detail. The proposed Clayton ward would comprise Clayton Golf Course and Pasture Lane. We would welcome further representations regarding Clayton ward at Stage Three as we recognise that access between the north and south of this ward is limited. Although we investigated alternative options, we felt that none of these alternatives were an improvement and, as the proposed Clayton ward is based on the existing ward, to which we

received no opposition at Stage One, we are content to put it forward as part of our draft recommendations.

83 We propose that Thornton ward should include Denholme parish from Bingley Rural ward and Clews Moor and West Scholes should be transferred to Queensbury ward, the latter being proposed by both the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives, to improve electoral equality. We also propose transferring Grange Avenue and Rhodesia Avenue to Clayton ward to better reflect their access route to the rest of Clayton ward. The Horton Bank area (part of polling district 19J) in the north west of the ward would be transferred out of the proposed Queensbury ward, as would the area adjacent to the southern half of Mandale Road (part of polling district 19H) in the west of the ward. We have decided to implement the Conservatives' proposed Royds ward, with the exception that the Carr House Gate area (part of polling district 30C) would remain in Wyke ward and the addition of the Mandale Road area (part of polling district 19H) from Queensbury ward to improve electoral equality. We propose adopting the Conservatives' Wyke ward with one amendment, as detailed earlier.

84 The Conservatives' proposed Wibsey ward would contain parts of the existing Wibsey and Odsal wards and "more truly reflects the 'village' of Wibsey and its environs" (The Conservatives). We have made three minor amendments to tie the ward boundaries to better ground detail. We have also decided to adopt the Conservatives' proposed ward of Little Horton, with a few amendments. We propose that Little Horton ward should include the Parkside area east of the railway from Bowling ward to better reflect community identity, and the areas adjacent to Park Road (polling district 17A and part of 17B) should be transferred to the proposed City ward. The Broomfields and Ripleyville areas (polling districts 17D and part of 17C), to the east of the main railway line, would be transferred out of Little Horton ward as proposed by the Conservatives.

85 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for City, Heaton and Thornton wards would be 4%, 7% and 3% above the district average respectively (5%, 7% and 2% above by 2006). Clayton, Great Horton, Little Horton, Queensbury, Royds, Wibsey and Wyke wards would have electoral variances 2%, 1%, 3%, 5%, 4%, 1% and 1% below the district average respectively (equal to, 1%, 5%, 3%, 4%, 3% and 3% below by 2006). Toller ward would have an electoral variance 1% below the district average (1% above by 2006).

Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Idle, Undercliffe and Tong wards

86 The existing Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Idle, Undercliffe and Tong wards make up the unparished area to the east of Bradford district. The number of electors per councillor for the wards of Bowling and Idle are currently 6% and 11% above the district average respectively (5% and 13% above by 2006); Bolton, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Undercliffe and Tong wards have electoral variances 9%, 5%, 17%, 10% and 15% below the district average respectively (7%, 4%, 20%, 12% and 18% below by 2006).

87 The Conservatives' proposed Bolton ward would now include the industrial estate and area adjacent to North Avenue (polling district 26D) from Undercliffe and the area around Norman Avenue, whose "streets fit well with the main community of Bolton". However, part of Wrose currently in Bolton ward would be transferred to the proposed Shipley East ward. The Conservatives stated that the current Bowling ward is slightly oversized and so they proposed the transfer of the Tyersal and Dudley Hill areas (polling districts 5J, 5M and part of 5H) to their proposed Tong ward. They also included two parts of Little Horton ward east of the main railway line in the new Bowling ward. No changes were proposed for Bradford Moor ward as the current ward structure is "cohesive and within the accepted variance."

88 The Conservatives stated that the existing Eccleshill ward is currently undersized, and addressed this by proposing the addition of the Fagley area from Undercliffe ward, the inclusion of the part of Thorpe Edge currently within Idle ward and the transfer of the areas adjacent to Bolton Drive and Norman Avenue (part of polling district 9E) to Bolton ward. To reduce Idle ward's electorate, they proposed the transfer of Esholt village to the proposed Baildon ward, "reflecting the closer association and links to that community" and uniting the two parts of Thorpe Edge within the proposed Eccleshill ward. However, part of the existing Shipley East ward, opposite the new Cote Farm development, would be included in the new Idle ward.

89 The extension of the current Undercliffe ward was proposed by the Conservatives to create a new Manningham & Undercliffe ward. This would include the main part of Manningham to bring "together the heart of an historic community while maintaining the established connection across the valley to Undercliffe village." The Fagley community would transfer to the proposed Eccleshill ward. The Tyersal and Dudley Hill areas (polling districts 5J, 5M and part of 5H) from Bowling ward would be transferred to the currently undersized Tong ward. The majority of Tong ward's boundaries are with neighbouring authorities and the M606 makes a strong boundary with Wyke ward so there is little scope to amend the boundaries.

90 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new Idle & Thackley ward based on the existing Idle ward but removing the Cote Farm West area "to reduce the number of electors in this currently oversized ward." The proposed Eccleshill ward would include the communities of Haigh Fold and Fagley (polling districts 26J and 26K), and the two adjoining communities of Bolton & Undercliffe would be combined into one new ward. This would be bound on the west side by Canal Road and, on the east side, by Leeds Road. It would comprise some of the Otley Road area from Bowling ward. Another new ward, Manningham, was proposed, including all the areas currently locally identified by the Liberal Democrats as Manningham to the west of Bolton & Undercliffe ward. The proposed Manningham ward would include the area from Lister Park in the north of the ward to City Road in the south.

91 The Liberal Democrats proposed no changes to Bradford Moor ward. The Tyersal Gate and Holme Wood area (polling district 5J) would be transferred out of their proposed Bowling ward and would be united with the rest of Holme Wood in a new Tong ward. Streets on the south side of the Dudley Hill roundabout, south of Cutler Heights Lane and Rooley Lane, would also be transferred. The proposed Bowling ward would include some of the streets in East Bowling (part of polling district 17D), bounded by Balfour Street and Rhine Street. The proposed Tong ward would comprise the whole of Oakenshaw (polling districts 25A and part of 30E) as well as the Holme Wood area.

92 Bradford Metropolitan District Council proposed the deletion of a ward in east Bradford city in their consultation scheme. This was to accommodate the predominance of over-represented wards in the area, and would result in significant redrawing of all other ward boundaries in east Bradford. Bolton and Undercliffe wards were the two wards to be combined.

93 After careful consideration of all submissions received during Stage One, we propose to adopt the Conservatives' scheme as we consider their proposals to provide the best reflection of the east Bradford communities, having visited the area, and offer good levels of electoral equality. We propose adopting their proposals for Idle ward as they utilise good boundaries. However, we propose two amendments. First, we propose uniting West Royd in the proposed Shipley East ward. Second, we propose that Eccleshill ward should include the southern part of Thorpe Edge currently in Idle ward, taking the boundary to the back of Bracken Edge and Orchard Grove roads, (part of polling district 12D) to improve electoral equality. With the exception of the amendment to the Thorpe Edge area, we propose adopting the Conservatives' Eccleshill ward. Our proposed Bolton ward would also include the industrial works east of the railway and the area of Undercliffe to the north of the A658 road (Otley Road). It would therefore be renamed Bolton & Undercliffe ward, and part of Wrose would be transferred to the proposed Shipley East ward, which would join this community in one ward. These proposals would result

in parts of Undercliffe being included in two different wards, but we consider this scheme to offer the best warding arrangement for this area by providing good levels of electoral equality. We also noted that the Conservatives, the District Council and the Liberal Democrats all proposed dividing Undercliffe between different wards.

94 Neither the Liberal Democrats nor the Conservatives proposed changes to Bradford Moor ward. However, we propose using the railway line as a boundary in the south of the ward and would then take the boundary up Birksland Street and behind Joba Avenue, Abaseen Close, Pennyoaks Hill and Burnsall Road to group similar communities together and improve electoral equality. We propose adopting the Conservatives' Bowling ward in the south east of the ward with two amendments, to ensure that housing estates to the east and west of Dick Lane are not divided. In the north of the ward, we propose that Bowling ward would also include the area to the south of the A658 road (Otley Road) and be renamed Bowling & Barkerend ward to reflect this change. As previously stated, Parkside, to the south of the ward, would be transferred to the proposed Little Horton ward to better reflect community identity by taking into account where the best access to the area lies, and the areas of Broomfields and Ripleyville, to the east of the main railway line, would be included in the proposed Bowling & Barkerend ward. We propose adopting the Conservatives' Tong ward, with the two amendments previously mentioned. We have adopted these wards as we consider them to best meet the statutory criteria by respecting local communities, utilising good boundaries and providing good levels of electoral equality.

95 Under our draft recommendations, the number of electors per councillor for Bolton & Undercliffe, Bowling & Barkerend, Eccleshill, Idle and Tong wards would be 1%, 6%, 5%, 1% and 6% above the district average respectively (2%, 4%, 2%, 3% and 3% above by 2006). Manningham ward would have an electoral variance 3% below the district average both initially and in 2006. Bradford Moor ward would have an electoral variance equal to the district average, both initially and in 2006.

Electoral cycle

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

Conclusions

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

- Bradford Metropolitan District Council should have 90 members, as at present;
- there should be 30 wards, as at present;
- the boundaries of all 30 of the existing wards should be modified.

98 Our draft recommendations would involve modifying all of the existing wards in Bradford district, as summarised below:

- in the north of Bradford, we propose adopting the Liberal Democrats' proposals with one modification between the proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards to improve electoral equality;
- for the rest of Bradford, we propose broadly adopting the Conservatives' proposals with a number of our own proposals to group similar communities in single wards and tie ward boundaries to better ground detail;
- we propose that the Leeds to Halifax railway line through the centre of Bradford city is utilised as a boundary and consequently we have modified the Conservatives' scheme in this area.

99 Table 5 shows how our draft recommendations will affect 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 Electorate	
	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations	Current arrangements	Draft recommendations
Number of councillors	90	90	90	90
Number of wards	30	30	30	30
Average number of electors per councillor	3,737	3,737	3,787	3,787
Number of wards with a variance more than 10 % from the average	11	1	14	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20 % from the average	1	0	3	0

100 As shown in Table 5, our draft recommendations for Bradford District Council would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance more than 10% from 11 to one. By 2006, only one ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of more than 10%.

Draft recommendation

Bradford 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.

Parish Council electoral arrangements

101 When reviewing electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Act. The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different district wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward of the district. Accordingly, we propose consequential warding arrangements for the parishes of Ilkley and Keighley to reflect the proposed district wards.

102 The parish of Ilkley is currently served by 21 councillors representing seven wards: Ben Rhydding, Burley, Holme, Menston, North, South and West wards. Each parish ward currently returns three councillors. At Stage One, we received three submissions regarding this area.

103 Ilkley Parish Council argued that “there does not appear to be a need to change the boundaries of the parish council wards which lie within Rombalds Ward ... as they cover clearly defined communities.”

104 Burley Community Council stated Burley and Menston are “long established natural communities”, experiencing considerable growth. For these reasons, it proposed that separate Burley and Menston parish wards should be established. It also proposed dividing that part of Holme parish ward situated in Menston into a revised Menston parish ward. The remainder of Holme parish ward would be transferred into a revised Burley parish ward. Menston Community Association accepted the need to divide Holme parish ward between Burley and Menston parish wards. They proposed that that Burley parish ward should return five councillors and Menston parish ward should return four councillors. This would represent a reduction in council size from 21 to 20.

105 We propose adopting Burley Community Council’s proposals as they respect community identity, based on the argumentation provided, and have received local support from Menston Community Association. However, we do not propose changing the council size as Ilkley Parish Council does not support this change, but would welcome comments from local residents during Stage Three. We also propose modifications to Ben Rhydding, North and South parish wards to reflect the boundaries of the proposed district wards of Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale. These changes were to ensure the Ben Rhydding parish ward boundary followed the railway line into Ilkley town and then the river down to the district ward boundary as detailed earlier. West parish ward remains unchanged. However, we propose the number of councillors representing each parish ward is altered to better reflect the number of electors in each parish ward. Ben Rhydding ward would return two councillors, North ward would return three councillors, South ward would return two councillors and West ward would return four councillors. We suggest that the proposed Burley parish ward returns six councillors and the proposed Menston parish ward returns four councillors to reflect the increase of electors in each parish ward.

Draft recommendation

Ilkley Parish Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Ben Rhydding (returning two councillors), Burley (returning six councillors), Menston (returning four councillors), North (returning three councillors), South (returning two councillors) and West (returning four councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Map 2 at the back of this report.

106 Keighley Town Council is currently served by 30 councillors representing 15 parish wards; Bogthorn & Exley, Brackenbank & Ingrow, Fell Lane & Westburn, Guardhouse, Highfield, Knowle Park, Lawkholme & Showfield, Laycock & Braithwaite, Long Lee & Parkwood,

Morton & Sandbeds, Oakworth, Riddlesden & Stockbridge, Spring Gardens & Utley, Town and Woodhouse & Hainworth wards. We propose amending two parish ward boundaries to reflect changes to the district wards. These are the eastern boundary of Lawkholme & Showfield ward, so that it would follow Bradford Road, and the southern boundary of Knowle Park ward, so that the boundary would run in front of the houses along Rawling Street and Grafton Road. We are not proposing to change the number of councillors returned from each parish ward.

Draft recommendation

Keighley Town Council should comprise 30 councillors, as at present, representing 15 wards: Bogthorn & Exley (returning one councillor), Brackenbank & Ingrow (returning three councillors), Fell Lane & Westburn (returning three councillors), Guardhouse (returning one councillor), Highfield (returning two councillors), Knowle Park (returning one councillor), Lawkholme & Showfield (returning two councillors), Laycock & Braithwaite (returning one councillor), Long Lee & Parkwood (returning two councillors), Morton & Sandbeds (returning two councillors), Oakworth (returning three councillors), Riddlesden & Stockbridge (returning three councillors), Spring Gardens & Utley (returning three councillors), Town (returning one councillor) and Woodhouse & Hainworth (returning two councillors). The parish ward boundaries should reflect the proposed district ward boundaries in the area, as illustrated and named on Maps 1, 2, 3 and 4 at the back of this report.

Map 2: Draft recommendations for Bradford

5 What happens next?

107 There will now be a consultation period, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Bradford contained in this report. We will take fully into account all submissions received by 7 April 2003. Any received *after* this date may not be taken into account. All responses may be inspected at our offices and those of the District Council. A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

108 Express your views by writing directly to us:

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

109 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 Bradford: **Detailed mapping**

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

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

The **large maps** illustrate the existing and proposed warding arrangements for Bradford.

Map A1: Draft recommendations for Bradford: 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, 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: The 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.