

Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bradford

Report to The Electoral Commission

July 2003

© Crown Copyright 2003

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

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

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

This report is printed on recycled paper.
Report no: 343

Contents

	Page
What is The Boundary Committee for England?	5
Summary	7
1 Introduction	13
2 Current electoral arrangements	15
3 Draft recommendations	19
4 Responses to consultation	21
5 Analysis and final recommendations	25
6 What happens next?	53
Appendices	
A Final recommendations for Bradford: detailed mapping	55
B Guide to interpreting the first draft of the electoral change Order	57
C First draft of the electoral change Order for Bradford	59

What is The Boundary Committee for England?

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

Members of the Committee are:

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

Archie Gall (Director)

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

This report sets out our final recommendations on the electoral arrangements for the district of Bradford.

Summary

We began a review of Bradford's electoral arrangements on 8 May 2002. We published our draft recommendations for electoral arrangements on 11 February 2003, after which we undertook an eight-week period of consultation. We now submit final recommendations to The Electoral Commission.

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

We found that the existing arrangements provide unequal representation of electors in 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 final recommendations for future electoral arrangements (see Tables 1 and 2 and paragraphs 178–179) 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 29 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 26 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 four wards, Bingley, Bingley Rural, Craven and Wharfedale, expected to vary by more than 10% from the average for the district in 2006.**

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

- **new warding arrangements for Ilkley parish;**
- **revised warding arrangements for the parish of Keighley.**

All further correspondence on these final recommendations and the matters discussed in this report should be addressed to The Electoral Commission, which will not make an Order implementing them before 9 September 2003. The information in the representations will be available for public access once the Order has been made.

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

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

Table 1: Final recommendations: Summary

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Constituent areas	Large map reference
1	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; part of Shipley West ward; part of Thornton ward; Cullingworth parish; Denholme 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 & Fairweather	3	Clayton ward; part of Great Horton ward; part of Queensbury ward; part of Thornton ward	4 and 7
9	Craven	3	Addingham parish; 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 & Thackley	3	Part of Idle ward	5
14	Ilkley	3	Part of Ilkley parish (the existing Ben Rhydding, 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
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

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

Notes:

- 1) *The wards in 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: Final 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	11,842	3,947	6	12,128	4,043	7
2	Bingley	3	12,485	4,162	11	12,688	4,229	12
3	Bingley Rural	3	13,070	4,357	17	13,457	4,486	18
4	Bolton & Undercliffe	3	11,360	3,787	1	11,565	3,855	2
5	Bowling & Barkerend	3	11,941	3,980	7	11,917	3,972	5
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 & Fairweather	3	10,939	3,646	-2	11,379	3,793	0
9	Craven	3	12,613	4,204	13	12,844	4,281	13
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	10,267	3,422	-8	10,357	3,452	-9
13	Idle & Thackley	3	11,276	3,759	1	11,661	3,887	3
14	Ilkley	3	11,161	3,720	0	11,279	3,760	-1
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	10,628	3,543	-5	10,780	3,593	-5
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	3	10,999	3,666	-2	11,152	3,717	-2
23	Thornton	3	11,292	3,764	1	11,176	3,725	-2
24	Toller	3	11,078	3,693	-1	11,443	3,814	1
25	Tong	3	11,782	3,927	5	11,667	3,889	3
26	Wharfedale	3	8,967	2,989	-20	9,425	3,142	-17
27	Wibsey	3	11,061	3,687	-1	11,045	3,682	-3
28	Worth Valley	3	10,321	3,440	-8	10,628	3,543	-6
29	Wrose	3	10,974	3,658	-2	11,051	3,684	-3
30	Wyke	3	11,115	3,705	-1	10,970	3,657	-3
	Totals	90	336,285	-	-	340,852	-	-
	Averages	-	-	3,737	-	-	3,787	-

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 final recommendations for the electoral arrangements for the district of Bradford. We are reviewing the five metropolitan authorities 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 undertaken by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England, which reported to the Secretary of State in June 1979 (Report No. 337).

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

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

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

5 Our task is to make recommendations on the number of councillors who should serve on a council, and the number, boundaries and names of wards. 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, so far as possible, equal representation across the district as a whole. Schemes which would result in, or retain, an electoral imbalance of over 10% in any ward will have to be fully justified. Any imbalances of 20% or more should only arise in the most exceptional circumstances, and will require the strongest justification.

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

8 Under the provisions of the Local Government Act 1972 there is no limit to the number of councillors who 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 lead to an unacceptable dilution of accountability to the electorate and we have not, to date, prescribed any wards with more than three councillors.

9 This review was in four stages. Stage One began on 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 constituencies in the district, the Members of the European Parliament for the Yorkshire & Humber region, and the headquarters of the main political parties. We placed a notice in the local press, issued a press release and invited the District Council to publicise the review further. The closing date for receipt of representations, the end of Stage One, was 27 August 2002. At Stage Two we considered all the representations received during Stage One and prepared our draft recommendations.

10 Stage Three began on 11 February 2003 with the publication of the report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bradford*, and ended on 7 April 2003. During this period comments were sought from the public and any other interested parties on the preliminary conclusions. In light of submissions received regarding Denholme parish, we carried out a further period of limited consultation in relation to the most appropriate warding arrangement for this parish and consequential amendments to the surrounding wards. On 7 May 2003 we wrote to the District Council, Denholme Town Council and all those who sent in submissions regarding Denholme parish, Heaton and Thornton wards during Stage Three. We outlined our options for the area and invited respondents to submit their views by 23 May 2003. Finally, during Stage Four the draft recommendations were reconsidered in the light of the Stage Three consultation and we now publish the final recommendations.

2 Current electoral arrangements

11 The metropolitan district of Bradford stretches over Airedale, Wharfedale and the Worth Valley, and includes the towns of Shipley, Bingley, Keighley and Ilkley as well as 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, technology and tourism, with a lively cultural scene.

12 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.

13 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.

14 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, with one ward varying by more than 20%. The worst imbalance is in University ward, where each councillor represents 25% more electors than the district average.

15 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 3: Existing electoral arrangements

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2001)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2006)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	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
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 significantly under-represented by 25%. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

3 Draft recommendations

16 During Stage One, 13 representations were received, including two district-wide schemes from the Bradford Council Conservative Group and the Bradford Council Liberal Democrat Group, and representations from one parish and one town council, two community organisations, the local police authority and four local residents. Two petitions were also received from local residents. In the light of these representations and evidence available to us, we reached preliminary conclusions which were set out in our report, *Draft recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Bradford*.

17 Our draft recommendations involved modifying all of the existing wards in Bradford, to achieve an improved level of electoral equality. In the north of Bradford, we adopted 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 broadly adopted the Conservatives' proposals with a number of our own amendments to group similar communities in single wards and tie ward boundaries to ground detail. We proposed that the Leeds to Halifax railway line that runs through the centre of Bradford city be used as a boundary and consequently modified the Conservatives' scheme in this area. We proposed that:

- Bradford Metropolitan District Council should be served by 90 councillors, the same as at present;
- the boundaries of all 30 of the existing wards should be modified;
- there should be new warding arrangements for Ilkley Parish Council and Keighley Town Council.

Draft recommendation

Bradford Metropolitan District Council should comprise 90 councillors, serving 30 wards.

18 Our proposals would have resulted in significant improvements in electoral equality, with the number of electors per councillor in 29 of the 30 wards varying by no more than 10% from the district average. This level of electoral equality was forecast to continue, with only one ward, Craven ward, varying by more than 10% from the average by 2006.

4 Responses to consultation

19 During the consultation on the draft recommendations report, 239 representations were received. A list of all respondents is available from us on request. All representations may be inspected at our offices and those of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.

Bradford Metropolitan District Council

20 The District Council supported the proposed council size and provided additional information in support of a council of 90 members.

The Conservative Group

21 The Conservative Group on the Council (the Conservatives) broadly supported the draft recommendations, but proposed a number of amendments to Bingley, Bingley Rural, Bolton & Undercliffe, Bowling & Barkerend, Clayton, Craven, Heaton, Ilkley, Manningham, Queensbury, Royds, Shipley East, Shipley West, Thornton, Toller and Wharfedale wards. They also proposed a number of ward name changes.

The Labour Party and the Labour Group

22 The Labour Party for the Yorkshire & Humber region and the Labour Group on the Council (Labour) submitted identical district-wide submissions. They proposed amendments to Baildon, Bingley, Bingley Rural, Bolton & Undercliffe, Bowling, City, Craven, Eccleshill, Heaton, Idle, Ilkley, Manningham, Queensbury, Royds, Shipley East, Shipley West, Toller, Tong, Undercliffe and Wharfedale wards. They also queried the District Council's projected electorate for Eccleshill, Idle and Shipley East wards and proposed a number of ward name changes.

The Liberal Democrat Group

23 The Liberal Democrat Group on the Council (the Liberal Democrats) proposed a number of amendments to the draft recommendations. They proposed modifications to Baildon, Bolton & Undercliffe, Bowling & Barkerend, Eccleshill, Idle, Little Horton, Shipley East and Tong wards. A number of ward name changes were also proposed.

Parish and town councils

24 Ilkley Parish Council submitted a 40-page petition, with approximately 800 signatures, objecting to the proposal to transfer Ben Rhydding parish ward of Ilkley parish from Ilkley ward to the proposed Wharfedale ward. Addingham Parish Council and Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council both argued that Addingham parish should remain in Craven ward to reflect community identity.

25 We received a submission with a 60-page petition attached, with approximately 1,000 signatures, from Denholme Town Council. It argued that Denholme parish should remain in Bingley Rural ward, and should not be transferred to Thornton ward as proposed in the draft recommendations, again for reasons of community identity.

Other representations

26 A further 230 representations were received in response to our draft recommendations from local political groups, organisations, councillors and residents.

27 Bolton Ward Conservative Branch proposed that Bolton & Undercliffe ward be renamed Bolton ward. The Micklethwaite Village Society supported the proposal to transfer Micklethwaite from the existing Rombalds ward to the proposed Bingley ward. Burley Community Council stated that it supported the proposed Burley and Menston parish wards of Ilkley parish in the proposed Wharfedale ward. It also queried Bradford Council's projected electorate figures for the Burley area of the proposed Wharfedale ward.

28 Ilkley Civic Society objected to the proposal to transfer Ben Rhydding parish ward of Ilkley parish to the proposed Wharfedale ward and argued that it had strong community links with Ilkley town. It also queried Bradford Council's projected electorate figures for Ilkley ward. Ilkley Design Statement Group expressed its strong opposition to the proposal to divide Ilkley town between two district wards. Menston Community Association also objected to this proposal and the inclusion of Addingham parish in the proposed Ilkley ward, and provided a number of alternative options.

29 Heaton Township Association objected to the proposal to transfer the Heaton Syke area out of Heaton ward to the proposed Manningham ward and provided alternative warding arrangements for this area. The Frizinghall Partnership argued that the Frizinghall area should remain in Shipley West ward, and not be transferred to Heaton ward as proposed in the draft recommendations. The Shipley Constituency Community Development Team also opposed the transfer of the Frizinghall area and proposed alternative boundaries in the area. It stated that the Valley Road area was also part of Shipley, rather than Heaton. Baildon Local History Society argued that Baildon ward should be retained on its existing boundaries.

30 Councillor Smith (Ilkley ward) objected to the proposed Ilkley ward and argued that it should be retained on its existing boundaries. He also proposed changes to the external district boundaries. Councillor Pitts and Councillor King (Heaton ward) objected to the proposal to transfer part of Heaton ward to the proposed Manningham ward. Councillor King proposed an alternative boundary between the two wards and included submissions he had received from local residents.

31 Councillor Attenborough (Eccleshill ward) objected to the proposal to transfer the Norman Avenue area from Eccleshill ward to the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward, and included submissions he had received from local residents opposing this proposed transfer. Councillor Thornton (Shipley East ward), writing on behalf of the Shipley East ward councillors, opposed the transfer of the Valley Road area and the Frizinghall area to the proposed Heaton ward. He provided an alternative warding arrangement for Shipley East ward, incorporating these two areas.

32 Councillor Richardson (Thornton ward) proposed minor amendments to the proposed Thornton ward and Councillors Cairns, Johnson and Ruding (Tong ward) all proposed the same minor amendment to the proposed Tong ward.

33 We received 51 representations from local residents supporting the proposal to transfer Crossflatts and Micklethwaite from the existing Rombalds ward to the proposed Bingley ward. We also received 17 representations from local residents objecting to the draft recommendations for Ilkley ward.

34 We received 34 representations, including a nine-page petition with approximately 150 signatures, from local residents arguing that the triangular area to the south of the railway in

Bingley town should remain in Bingley ward, and not be transferred to Bingley Rural ward as proposed in the draft recommendations.

35 A petition was received from the residents of New Brighton, arguing that the hamlet looks to Cottingley in Bingley and so should remain in Bingley Rural ward. We received 30 submissions from local residents objecting to the proposal to transfer the parish of Denholme from Bingley Rural ward to Thornton ward. We received one submission in support of the proposal to transfer Harden village to Bingley Rural ward, and five submissions objecting to this proposal, all from local residents.

36 We received 29 representations, including three petitions with approximately 200 signatures in total, from local residents objecting to the proposal to transfer the Heaton Syke area from Heaton ward to the proposed Manningham ward.

37 We received 17 submissions from local residents opposing the transfer of the Norman Avenue area from Eccleshill ward to the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward. Another local resident objected to the proposal to include the Frizinghall area in the proposed Heaton ward and argued that it was part of Shipley. We received 21 representations from local residents objecting to the proposal to transfer the area of Lower Baildon into the proposed Shipley West ward.

38 A local resident objected to the proposed Royds ward and queried the District Council's projected electorate figures for the Buttershaw area. Three submissions were received from local residents supporting the proposed Tong ward and one submission was received objecting to any boundary changes in Bradford.

39 One submission requested a modification to the boundary between two parishes, and a number of additional submissions, and several of those listed above, proposed changes to the external district boundaries.

Further consultation

40 In light of the submissions received at Stage Three, we undertook limited further consultation in the Denholme, Heaton and Thornton areas. During this limited further consultation, we received 18 responses.

41 The Conservatives opposed the proposal to transfer the Sandy Lane area from Heaton ward to the proposed Thornton ward. They suggested some alternative amendments to the area. Labour supported the proposal to retain Denholme parish in Bingley Rural ward, and proposed an alternative amendment to reduce the electorate in the resulting Bingley Rural ward.

42 Denholme Town Council supported the proposal to retain Denholme Parish in Bingley Rural ward, but proposed amendments to Bingley and Thornton wards to achieve better electoral equality. Heaton Township Association supported the proposal to transfer the Sandy Lane area to the proposed Thornton ward.

43 Councillor King opposed the proposed transfer of the Sandy Lane area from Heaton ward, while Councillor Pitts supported this proposal. Two local residents supported the proposal to retain Denholme parish in Bingley Rural ward and another resident supported the transfer of the Sandy Lane area to Thornton ward. Four local residents supported both of these proposals.

44 We received five submissions from local residents, which related to other areas that we were not consulting on at this stage and therefore could not be taken into account.

5 Analysis and final recommendations

45 As described earlier, our prime objective 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'.

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

47 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.

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

Electorate forecasts

49 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 that many wards are currently substantially under-represented. Baildon, Craven, Idle and Queensbury wards have seen their electorate rise with the building of new estates of residential properties. There has also been significant population growth in inner-city wards in Bradford, most notably in University ward. The demolition of public sector housing on other estates has seen the electorate of wards decrease, notably in Eccleshill, Thornton and Tong wards. 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. Having accepted that this is an inexact science, and having considered the forecast electorates, we stated in our draft recommendations report that we were satisfied that these figures represented the best estimates that could reasonably be made at the time.

50 We received five queries on the District Council's projected electorate figures for 2006 during Stage Three, from the Labour Party, the Labour Group, Burley Community Council, Ilkley Civic Society and a local resident. Labour challenged the figures for Eccleshill, Idle and Shipley East wards, arguing that 'there are a small number of areas where their estimate has failed to take

into account current plans for the building and demolition of a significant number of houses'. Burley Community Council argued that 'there are currently 202 houses in the two new estates being built in Burley, so we think that the growth by 2006 will significantly exceed the 300 estimate'. Ilkley Civic Society stated that the 'projection of additional electors in Ilkley is lower than the number of planning applications approved for additional dwelling units in the last three years ... [therefore] ... we consider that the increase in electors will be much higher than you suggest'. A local resident considered that '640 new houses are being built in the Buttershaw area, a fact that seems to be overlooked by those who claim to have worked out the number of electors.' These submissions were all forwarded to the District Council, and it was invited to comment on them.

51 In its response, the District Council described the two different projection methodologies used to calculate the 2006 projections of electorate in each ward. An average of these two separate projections was then used to give the final figure. It demonstrated how this methodology was applied in each of the wards where the figures were queried, before concluding that the original electorate projections were accurate. Having considered these queries and the District Council's response, we remain satisfied that the original figures represent the best estimates currently available.

Council size

52 Bradford Metropolitan District Council presently has 90 members.

53 At Stage One the Conservatives 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 that 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'.

54 Both the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats were asked to provide further evidence and argumentation supporting a council size of 90 members. The Conservatives subsequently provided 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'. They also stated that new technologies have increased the ability for the public to contact councillors, increasing the workload 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 the provision of 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'.

55 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 a reduction in council size could result in only those not in employment

or without family responsibilities standing for election, and that the currently lower than average age profile of councillors would change.

56 The District Council's consultation scheme (which it later withdrew) was based on a council of 90 members, the same as at present. It considered that 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 representing the interests of residents and the authority on a number of outside bodies. It also stated that a reduction in the number of councillors and therefore wards would make the current structure of geographically large rural wards and small urban wards even more pronounced and would increase councillors' difficulties in travelling around their areas, equating to additional time demands.

57 We carefully considered all the comments received at Stage One concerning council size. We were not 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 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 did not 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 were aware, there was no opposition to this council size. We also noted that the retention of the existing council size received cross-party support, and provided for the correct allocation of councillors between the urban and rural parts of the district. Therefore, having looked at the size and distribution of the electorate, the geography and other characteristics of the area, together with the responses received, we based our draft recommendations on a council of 90 members.

58 At Stage Three we received no opposition to the proposed council size of 90 members. Indeed, the District Council provided us with further argumentation for a council of this size. It argued that it had a 'longer experience of operating modernised decision making structures than most authorities and [is therefore] well placed to comment on the demands that these new arrangements make on members'. It stated that these changes in structure had led to an increase in councillors' workload and provided evidence to support this fact; for example, 'meetings tend to be longer and more demanding than in the past'.

59 The District Council went on to argue that 'a reduction in numbers from 90 members would make it difficult to cover the full range of committees in the structure and could necessitate either members being required to attend more meetings or a reduction in the number of members on committees'. It also noted that 'councillors represent a cross-section of the community that they serve including people who hold full time or part time jobs or other responsibilities. There is a distinct danger that increasing the workload on members by increasing the size of wards would be a disincentive to people who might otherwise consider standing for council.'

60 We have noted the support of the Council for the proposed council size and, in the absence of any opposition, we are content to confirm our draft recommendation to retain a council size of 90 as final.

Electoral arrangements

61 We received two district-wide schemes, from the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats, at Stage One, as well as 11 other submissions. Having carefully considered all these representations and having visited the area, we based the draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' scheme in the north of the district, as we considered that their proposals offered the most suitable warding arrangement for the area and provided good levels of electoral equality. However, we modified their proposals in a number of areas to tie ward boundaries to better ground detail.

62 In Keighley and Bradford city we based the draft recommendations on the Conservatives' proposals, as they provided good electoral equality and generally grouped similar communities together in single wards. However, we put forward a number of our own proposals and amendments to further improve electoral equality, place similar communities in single wards and tie boundaries to better ground detail. In Bradford city, where possible, we utilized 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 considered to be one of the strongest boundaries in the city and therefore, although we broadly based our draft recommendations for this area on the Conservatives' proposals, we moved away from them in a number of areas. We noted the fact that the Council's illustrative consultation scheme made use of this railway line.

63 We had some concerns over the extent to which the political groups represented on Bradford Council had engaged with the issues raised by this review at Stage One. 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 therefore requested further information on these matters at Stage Three of the review.

64 In response to our draft recommendations, a number of respondents provided us with the community identity argumentation we requested on various areas within the district of Bradford. As a result of these representations, we are proposing several amendments to provide a better reflection of community identities and interests. In the Baildon, Bingley, Heaton and Ilkley areas we have received strong argumentation and evidence regarding community identity and are therefore proposing to move away from the draft recommendations. We have also received strong argumentation regarding community identity in the Denholme area and, after limited further consultation and following careful consideration of all representations received, we are proposing significant amendments to Bingley Rural, Heaton and Thornton wards. Finally, we are proposing a number of minor amendments to Thornton, Tong and Bolton & Undercliffe wards, which were proposed locally to better reflect community identities and access routes. We are also proposing four ward name changes, put forward at Stage Three by the main political parties.

65 At Stage Three we received four submissions regarding race issues. As stated earlier, when formulating our final recommendations we have had regard to the general duty set out in section 71(1) of the Race Relation Act 1996 and the Statutory Code of Practice on the Duty to Promote Race Equality. The Boundary Committee considers all representations on their merits and no weight is given to representations from one racial group over another. Representations are considered on the basis of the level and quality of argumentation and evidence rather than the source of the representation. As part of the recommendations, The Boundary Committee may accept electoral imbalances on the basis of evidence regarding community identities and interests. However, while the ethnic or racial mix of an area can be a component of community identity, we do not consider that, in itself, it is sufficient evidence that a community exists. Therefore, as with all cases concerning community identity, we require evidence and argumentation demonstrating the existence of a community, how it manifests itself and why we should therefore accept relatively high levels of electoral inequality in certain areas. With regard

to the four submissions received regarding race issues in Bradford, we consider that such evidence and argumentation has only been provided in two of these instances, those regarding the Denholme and Heaton Syke areas. In these areas, in addition to the argumentation based on ethnicity, we received further community identity argumentation concerning such issues as the existence of a number of community groups, shared services and geographical links. Having considered all of the evidence, we have been persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations in both of these areas to provide what we consider to be a better reflection of community identities in both cases.

66 In the other two areas where we have received submissions on race-related issues, we do not consider that sufficient evidence and argumentation have been provided regarding community identity to persuade us to move away from the draft recommendations. These individual cases are discussed in more detail in the relevant sections of this chapter.

67 During the period of limited further consultation, we also received a submission from a local resident who opposed on racial grounds the proposed Manningham ward. However, during this period of further consultation we were only consulting on the proposed amendments to Heaton and Thornton wards in relation to Denholme parish and we were therefore unable to take these comments into account.

68 At Stage Three we received a submission which requested a modification to the boundary between two parishes, and a number of respondents proposed changes to the external district boundaries. However, amendments to external parish and district boundaries are beyond the remit of this review and we are therefore unable to have regard for these representations.

69 The draft recommendations have been reviewed in the light of further evidence and the representations received during Stage Three and the period of limited further consultation. 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 (page 29);
- b) Bingley, Bingley Rural and Rombalds wards (page 33);
- c) Baildon, Shipley East and Shipley West wards (page 38);
- d) Clayton, Great Horton, Heaton, Little Horton, Odsal, Queensbury, Thornton, Toller, University, Wibsey and Wyke wards (page 41);
- e) Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Idle, Tong and Undercliffe wards (page 45).

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

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

71 The existing Craven (comprising the parishes of Addingham, Silsden and Steeton with Eastburn), Ilkley (comprising Ben Rhydding, North, South and West parish wards of Ilkley parish), Keighley North (comprising Lawkholme & Showfield, Long Lee & Parkwood, Morton & Sandbeds and Riddlesden & Stockbridge parish wards of Keighley parish), Keighley South (comprising Brackenbank & Ingrow, Knowle Park, Town and Woodhouse & Hainworth parish wards of Keighley parish), Keighley West (comprising Fell Lane & Westburn, Guardhouse, Highfield, Laycock & Braithwaite and Spring Gardens & Utley parish wards of Keighley parish) and Worth Valley wards (comprising the parishes of Haworth, Cross Roads & Stanbury and Oxenhope, and Bogthorn & Exley and Oakworth parish wards of Keighley parish) are situated to the north and west of the district. Under the existing arrangements the number of electors per councillor in Craven, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards is 13%, 2% and 7% above the district average respectively (13%, 1% and 9% above by 2006). The number of electors per

councillor in Ilkley, Keighley North and Keighley South wards is equal to and 2% and 20% below the district average respectively (1%, 2% and 21% below by 2006).

72 At Stage One the Conservatives proposed retaining the existing Craven and Ilkley wards. Their proposed Keighley East ward would consist of the majority of the existing Keighley North ward, in addition to the communities of East Morton, Long Lee, Riddlesden and Thwaites Brow. They also proposed transferring the Hainworth & Woodhouse parish ward of Keighley Town Council 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, 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 encompass the Bracken Bank and Ingrow areas from the existing Keighley South ward, the Braithwaite, Fell Lane, Guardhouse and Laycock areas from the existing Keighley West ward and the Bogthorn and Exley Head areas from the existing Worth Valley ward. 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.

73 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 the existing Ben Rhydding parish ward of Ilkley Parish Council into a new Wharfedale ward. The remainder of the existing Ilkley ward would be included in a new Ilkley & Addingham ward along 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.

74 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 considered that no changes were necessary.

75 Keighley Town Council objected to the District Council's consultation scheme for the area and put forward its own proposals for these wards. It proposed that part of Craven ward 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 ward, and that the boundary between Craven ward and Keighley North ward should follow Clough Beck. This proposed ward would be renamed Craven & North Keighley ward. It proposed a number of modifications to the existing Keighley wards, resulting in amended Keighley Central, Keighley East and Keighley West wards. 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. This would result in a ward of four rural parishes with 'common interests' to be renamed Keighley Rural ward.

76 A local resident argued that Ilkley ward 'should remain with its clear boundary as indicated by the "Green Belt" area'. Two local residents objected to Beechcliffe being transferred to Keighley North ward and argued that the 'area is a natural part of the parish of Utley', which should remain in Keighley West ward.

77 In its consultation scheme, which was later withdrawn, Bradford Metropolitan District Council proposed a number of amended wards in this area, with the exception of Ilkley ward, which it proposed should remain unchanged.

78 After careful consideration of all representations received during Stage One, we broadly adopted the Liberal Democrats' proposals for the north of the district and the Conservatives' proposals for the Keighley area. Consequently, we adopted the Liberal Democrats' Ilkley & Addingham ward, with one amendment. This amendment was to the boundary between the Liberal Democrats' proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards. Our proposed boundary followed the Ilkley to Bradford and Leeds railway line through Ilkley town, before following Cowpasture Road, running around Craiglands Road and then following Backstone Beck to the boundary with the existing Rombalds ward. We considered that this amendment provided for stronger boundaries and improved electoral equality. We also adopted the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward, with the amendment outlined above. Both Ilkley town and the proposed Wharfedale ward are currently situated in the parish of Ilkley, and we concurred 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 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 had received a locally generated scheme which resolved this electoral variance, we based the draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards. We adopted the name Ilkley & Addingham, rather than Ilkley West as proposed by Keighley Town Council, as the proposed ward would include most of Ilkley town and Addingham parish.

79 Our proposed Craven ward consisted 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 was little scope to address the imbalance without transferring an area out of Keighley, which is a separate parish with few links to the area.

80 We adopted the Conservatives' Worth Valley ward as we considered that it best reflected community identity by grouping the south-western rural area in a single ward. The Conservatives also proposed three new wards in Keighley: Keighley Central, Keighley East and Keighley West. These proposed wards offered good levels of electoral equality and appeared to reflect community identities. However, we proposed 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 run in front of the houses along Rawling Street and Grafton Road. These amendments were to tie ward boundaries to better ground detail and group similar communities in single wards respectively.

81 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.

82 At Stage Three we received 25 submissions objecting to the proposed Ilkley ward, as well as comments from the main political parties. Labour stated that 'the current Ilkley ward boundary produces a settled ward of an almost ideal size and strongly reflects the community of Ilkley. Ilkley is a clearly distinguishable town with clearly identifiable boundaries.' The Conservatives also raised these points, stating that 'Ilkley is a clearly defined and recognisable community that conforms to the requirements of electoral equality.' However, the Liberal Democrats supported the proposed Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale wards.

83 All other submissions received regarding this area opposed the draft recommendations. Ilkley Parish Council submitted a petition with approximately 800 signatures. It argued that 'Ben Rhydding is, and always has been, a totally integral part of the Ilkley community [and] for facilities/amenities such as Ilkley Grammar School, the Ilkley Health Centre and Coronation Hospital to be effectively removed from Ilkley [is] contrary, we believe, to the wishes of not only the Ilkley residents but also those of Burley and Menston.' Burley Community Council stated that

'Ben Rhydding is inextricably part of Ilkley and wrenching any section of it away would be a distortion of the physical realities, the communal interests and popular feeling.' Ilkley Civic Society stated that 'Ilkley, together with Middleton and Ben Rhydding has a very strong sense of community, both geographically and socially', and expressed concern at 'the subsequent impact locally, affecting the operation of council bodies and services within our area'. Ilkley Design Statement Group argued that 'Ilkley, of which Ben Rhydding and Middleton are integral parts, is a single conurbation surrounded by green belt, a clear entity in itself and quite distinct from neighbouring communities [with] a very strong sense of community and a strong character of its own.' Menston Community Association pointed out that 'today on the ground it is not possible to distinguish where Ilkley ends and Ben Rhydding begins. Indeed we understand that the local residents consider themselves as a single community, and we can concur with this view.' Addingham Parish Council and Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council argued that the parish of Addingham should remain in Craven ward and not be transferred to the proposed Ilkley & Addingham ward on the grounds of preserving community identity.

84 Councillor Smith also objected to the proposed Ilkley ward and argued that it should be retained on its existing boundaries. We received 17 submissions from local residents opposing the proposed Ilkley ward and proposing the retention of the existing Ilkley ward. It was also argued that the draft recommendations would divide the community of Ben Rhydding, some of which would be transferred to the proposed Wharfedale ward and some of which would remain in the proposed Ilkley & Addingham ward. A local resident also considered that the draft recommendations would be 'likely to mean that [the Ben Rhydding] local parliamentary constituency is moved into Shipley ... whilst Ilkley remains in the Keighley constituency'.

85 Having carefully considered all the representations received, we are proposing two amendments to the draft recommendations in this area. We have been persuaded by the evidence and argumentation provided that Ben Rhydding parish ward should not be separated from Ilkley town because of strong community links between Ben Rhydding and the rest of Ilkley town. We have received evidence regarding the existence of community and voluntary groups working in the area, and the shared services such as health services. We have also noted the geography of the area and the fact that Ilkley town is surrounded by a green belt. We therefore propose to retain the existing Ilkley ward and consequently retain the four parish wards within Ilkley ward on their existing boundaries. On balance, and having considered the strong argumentation received regarding the community identity of Ilkley town, we consider that retaining the existing Ilkley ward in its entirety provides a better balance between electoral equality and the reflection of community identity in the area than the draft recommendations. Consequently, Addingham parish would remain in Craven ward, also as proposed locally; the Conservatives argued that 'the connection between Silsden and Addingham is strong'. Addingham Parish Council and Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council argued that the parish of Addingham should remain in Craven ward, and not be transferred to the proposed Ilkley & Addingham ward, for reasons of keeping it in a ward with similar rural communities that share the same interests. Craven ward would have an electoral variance of over 10% but, as stated by Labour, 'this imbalance is due to the area being on the edge of the district and also being a rural area'. We are also constrained by the need to provide a uniform pattern of three-member wards in all metropolitan areas.

86 Various warding arrangements for the Ilkley area were investigated by a number of respondents, including the option of a larger ward returning six councillors and a ward encompassing the proposed Wharfedale ward, without the parish ward of Ben Rhydding, and Addingham parish. However, these proposals were dismissed because, as stated by Labour, of the 'potential for a dilution of accountability to the electorate' and the poor links between the two parts of the proposed ward respectively. Addingham Parish Council also strongly objected to the latter proposal.

87 As part of this review we are unable to have regard for parliamentary constituency boundaries and therefore have been unable to take account of comments from local residents regarding the parliamentary constituencies in the Ilkley area.

88 Labour stated that they 'accept the proposals from the Boundary Committee for Keighley East, Keighley West, Keighley Central and Worth Valley wards'. However, the Liberal Democrats requested that we look again at 'the boundaries between the proposed new Keighley Central and Keighley West' wards because the proposed boundaries 'have the whole "inner city" area in Keighley Central' ward. They stated that they would support any proposals submitted 'that could amend these boundaries to achieve better social cohesion'. However, we did not receive any specific alternatives for this area and, in light of the good electoral equality and support from Labour, are content to endorse the draft recommendations for Keighley as final.

89 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in Craven ward would be 13% above the district average, both initially and by 2006. Ilkley, Keighley Central, Keighley East, Keighley West and Worth Valley wards would have electoral variances equal to, 2%, 2%, 1% and 8% below the district average respectively (1%, 3%, 2%, 2% and 6% below by 2006).

Bingley, Bingley Rural and Rombalds wards

90 The existing Bingley, Bingley Rural (including Cullingworth and Denholme parishes) and Rombalds (comprising Burley, Holme and Menston parish wards of Ilkley parish) wards cover the north-east of the district. The number of electors per councillor for the wards of Bingley Rural and Rombalds is currently 6% and 14% above the district average respectively (6% and 18% above by 2006). Bingley ward has an electoral variance 5% below the district average (4% below by 2006).

91 At Stage One the Conservatives 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. The Conservatives proposed transferring the area around Higher Coach Road out of Bingley ward and adding part of the existing Bingley Rural and Rombalds wards. The only proposed change to Bingley Rural ward would be around the Cottingley area, resulting in a slightly over-represented ward initially. The expected housing development in the ward would give an acceptable electoral variance by 2006.

92 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 would include the villages of Cullingworth and Harden.

93 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new ward, Wharfedale, made up of the northern part of the existing 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.

94 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 form

part of the proposed Keighley East ward, and Cullingworth and Denholme parishes would be transferred out of the ward into the proposed Keighley Rural ward.

95 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 as there are six kilometres of green belt between Burley and Eldwick, the nearest of the three communities in the north of the ward. Menston Community Association proposed moving Micklethwaite and Crossflatts into Keighley North ward if 'numbers became an imperative'.

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

97 Bradford Metropolitan District Council's consultation scheme proposed extending Bingley Rural ward into the rural areas of West Bradford.

98 We carefully considered all representations received regarding these wards during Stage One. We adopted the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward, with one amendment to use a stronger boundary and improve electoral equality. The proposed amendment was 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 concurred 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 Craven and Rombalds wards. As we had received a locally generated scheme which resolved this electoral variance, we were content to base our draft recommendations on the Liberal Democrats' proposed Wharfedale ward but stated that we would welcome comments from local people during Stage Three. The existing Rombalds ward would have an electoral 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 considered that the Liberal Democrats' proposals best addressed this anomaly.

99 As part of the draft recommendation Crossflatts, Eldwick and Micklethwaite (polling districts 20A and 20B), south of Rombalds Moor and in the valley of the River Aire, were transferred to Bingley ward, with which the residents have greater links, as proposed by Keighley Town Council. We proposed that the new Bingley ward include the southern part of Rombalds ward, but that 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) be transferred to Bingley Rural ward. The areas to the north and south of Higher Coach Road (polling district 2H) were transferred to Shipley West ward. In addition to including areas from Bingley ward, we proposed that Denholme parish be transferred from Bingley Rural ward to Thornton ward (polling districts 3A and 3B) and that Shipley High Moor (polling district 3H) be transferred to Heaton ward. In the light of all submissions received, we considered that our proposals for Bingley and Bingley Rural wards offered the most suitable warding arrangements for this area and best met the statutory criteria.

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

101 In response to the draft recommendations we received 54 representations from local organisations and residents supporting the proposal to transfer the Crossflatts and Micklethwaite areas from the existing Rombalds ward to the proposed Bingley ward. Burley Community

Council supported the proposal 'to restore Crossflatts, Eldwick and Micklethwaite to Bingley, their natural home [which] leaves the remainder of the old Rombalds ward, Burley and Menston, two distinct but similar townships, geographically close and with many common interests and problems'. Consequently, it argued that although 'creating one ward to encompass them alone would be at the limits of equality of representation, ... it would exactly reflect the identities and interests of these two local communities and it would secure effective and convenient local government without distorting geographical realities'. Menston Community Association stated that the proposal 'that Low Springs is moved to Baildon, and Eldwick, Micklethwaite and Crossflatts are moved to Bingley ... seems logical and [one] with which we concur'. It put forward a number of options for warding arrangements in the northern area of the district, its preferred option being to 'keep Burley and Menston together as a single ward [to] reflect the strong natural community'. The Micklethwaite Village Society stated that 'there is no doubt that our community of interest lies firmly with Bingley [which] can only increase with ... the likely further development of housing between Bingley and Micklethwaite'. Local residents also supported the boundary between the proposed Wharfedale ward and Bingley ward, arguing that there were very few links between the communities of Eldwick, Crossflatts and Micklethwaite and Burley and Menston, and that the proposed Wharfedale ward would provide a good reflection of community identity in the area.

102 We received 34 submissions, including a petition with approximately 150 signatures, from local residents arguing that the triangular area to the south of the railway in Bingley town should remain in Bingley ward. Labour and the Conservatives also opposed the draft recommendations for this area. Labour stated that 'these areas are integral parts of Bingley town, very close to the town centre and have no association with the villages of Bingley Rural'. It was argued that this area was yards away from the town centre and is therefore very much part of the town, with few links to the villages of Bingley Rural ward. For example, a local resident from the area to be transferred argued that 'I live in the Bingley area where I use Bingley shops, the Library, the Health Centre for doctor and nursing care needs, the Arts Centre for entertainment and have used the schools, namely Bingley Grammar school, for my children's education.' She went on to state: 'we are the community of Bingley as we take part in the local social events with our friends and neighbours, many of which events take place in Myrtle Park, just along the road'. It was also argued that 'we have no links or common interests ... with Cottingley or Wilsden'. Another local resident stated 'that part of Bingley between Beech Street and Healey Avenue is an integral part of the town, attached to the main street, the trunk road, the shops, station, transport, theatre and pubs, and has none but a neighbourly interest in the doings of the outdistricts'. A number of local residents pointed out that the area proposed to be transferred 'is literally a few hundred yards from Bingley Town Hall, the centre of Bingley'.

103 We received 31 submissions, including a petition collected by Denholme Town Council with approximately 1,000 signatures, objecting to the proposal to transfer Denholme parish to Thornton ward. The Conservatives proposed 'the retention of Denholme within Bingley Rural', but Labour stated that 'we accept the rationale for transferring Denholme into Thornton ward as there is some identity of interest between the town communities'. Denholme Town Council provided evidence of the 'close connections' between the villages of Denholme and Cullingworth, and described the 'good liaison and communication links' between the two. It stated that 'the villagers have been united in their battles over quarrying and the subsequent problems caused by landfill operations in the area, as well as rural transport difficulties'. It also stated that 'Denholme and Cottingley have both been working on Neighbourhood Action projects' and, together with a local resident, argued that Denholme had worked with Cullingworth on a number of environmental issues and had built up close links with the Shipley Area Co-ordinator's Office. It was also argued that Denholme and other villages of the existing Bingley Rural ward shared transport, education and health services. Many local residents objected to the rural area of Denholme being included in a ward that contained an urban area, arguing that 'their issues and problems are entirely different to ours'. Another concern was that 'we have similar youth and elderly issues' with the villages of Bingley Rural ward. We received a submission from a local resident, claiming that Denholme parish and the 'large Muslim community' of west

Bradford have 'nothing in common' and that to transfer the parish into Thornton ward would lead to Denholme being treated as 'an unimportant outpost'.

104 Five local residents opposed the draft recommendation to transfer Harden village from Bingley ward to Bingley Rural ward. A local resident stated that 'many people from Harden make frequent use of the facilities in Bingley and consider themselves part of Bingley'. One local resident supported the draft recommendations. He argued that 'there [are] greater similarities of interests between Harden and other villages which comprise the Bingley Rural ward than there are between Harden and the considerably larger township of Bingley'. He stated that he felt 'a greater affinity with Bradford and [made] far more use of facilities in that city or in Wilsden than those in Bingley'. Labour also supported the draft recommendations for this area as 'there is a close connection with Wilsden'.

105 A petition was received from the residents of New Brighton with 53 signatures and an additional letter, arguing that the hamlet looks to Cottingley in Bingley, with which it has good road links, and so should remain in Bingley Rural ward. The Conservatives and Labour made the same point; Labour stated that 'New Brighton has strong historical links with Cottingley – the properties in this small hamlet were originally built for miners and workers from Cottingley'.

106 Having carefully considered all the representations received at Stage Three, we are proposing five amendments to the draft recommendations in this area. We have been persuaded by the argumentation and evidence received that Denholme parish has strong community links with other villages in the existing Bingley Rural ward, in particular the village of Cullingworth. We have noted the evidence regarding the communities working together on environmental issues and Neighbourhood Action projects, as well as the reliance on shared services such as those relating to health and transport. We therefore consider that Denholme should remain in a ward with Cullingworth and other similar communities. However, retaining Denholme parish in Bingley Rural ward would result in Bingley Rural and Thornton wards having electoral variances of 18% and -19% by 2006 respectively. We do not consider that this level of electoral equality is acceptable in two neighbouring wards and therefore looked to address this imbalance through the transfer of the Sandy Lane area (polling district 11A) from the proposed Heaton ward to the proposed Thornton ward. If this proposal were adopted, Bingley Rural ward would have a variance of 18% by 2006, Heaton ward would have a variance of -9% by 2006 and Thornton ward would have a variance of -2% by 2006.

107 However, we considered that this would be too significant a change to make at this stage without knowledge of local feeling on the issue. Accordingly, we wrote to all who submitted representations regarding Denholme parish, Heaton and Thornton wards at Stage Three to ask for their views on this proposal. The extended period of consultation lasted until 23 May 2003.

108 We received 18 representations in response to the period of limited further consultation. Labour stated that 'if there are strong representations from local people [of Denholme parish] indicating their desire to remain in Bingley Rural [ward] then we would respect their views'. The Conservatives stated that 'the community of Sandy Lane, while it has its own identity, looks to Heaton and enjoys close links with that township'. Denholme Town Council supported the retention of Denholme parish in Bingley Rural ward and proposed amendments to Bingley and Thornton wards to achieve better electoral equality. Heaton Township Association supported the proposal, arguing that 'there is a very clear geographical divide between the Sandy Lane area and Heaton proper in the form of both hill and rural green space which discourages any unity of feeling between these two communities'. Councillor Pitts (Heaton ward) added that the Sandy Lane area 'is also relatively "self sufficient" in terms of having a local Primary School and park, together with shops and other community facilities'. Two local residents supported the proposal to retain Denholme parish in Bingley Rural ward, and another resident supported the transfer of the Sandy Lane area to Thornton ward. Four local residents supported both of these proposals, two of whom pointed out that 'the Sandy Lane residential area meets with those of Allerton and is a short distance from the Haworth Road area' in Thornton ward. However, some opposition

was received in addition to that provided by the Conservative Group. Councillor King (Heaton ward) argued that 'Sandy Lane ... has no links whatever with Thornton, physical, historic or social' and that 'Sandy Lane's links with Heaton are long-standing and logical'. We received five submissions from local residents, which related to other areas that we were not consulting on at this stage and therefore could not be taken into account.

109 The results of this further consultation period were mixed and, although the Conservatives and Councillor King opposed the proposal, conditional support was received from Labour, together with support from Heaton Township Association, Councillor Pitts and local residents. It was argued that the Sandy Lane area formed a distinct community, and we consider that transferring the Sandy Lane area into Thornton ward would unite it with the urban area in the east of the existing Thornton ward. We also noted that, at Stage One, both the Liberal Democrats and Keighley Town Council proposed transferring the Sandy Lane area out of the existing Heaton ward. Furthermore, we are unable to consider any area in isolation and are constrained by the need to provide a uniform pattern of three-member wards. It should also be noted that Bradford is not a typical urban area, containing many rural expanses.

110 Therefore, having carefully considered all the evidence received at Stage Three and during the further consultation period and in light of the argumentation received regarding the strong community links between Denholme and the other villages in Bingley Rural ward, we are proposing to transfer Denholme parish from the proposed Thornton ward into an amended Bingley Rural ward. Consequentially, we are proposing to transfer the Sandy Lane area from the proposed Heaton ward into a revised Thornton ward. We recognise that there is some opposition to the proposed transfer of the Sandy Lane area out of Heaton ward but consider that, on balance, the statutory criteria and, in particular, the provision of electoral equality would be best reflected by this consequential amendment to the proposed Heaton and Thornton wards.

111 With regard to the submission regarding the racial differences between Denholme village and West Bradford, as stated earlier, racial or ethnic issues can be taken into account as a component of community identity, but we do not consider that race or ethnicity, in itself, provides evidence of a community identity. We require further evidence and argumentation regarding community identity to supplement arguments based on race and, in this case, we consider that this additional evidence was provided by other respondents as detailed above.

112 In the remainder of this area, we are proposing three further amendments to the draft recommendations. We have not been persuaded by the suggestions received to amend the boundary between the proposed Bingley and Wharfedale wards to improve electoral equality due to the strong support we received for the draft recommendations in this area. Consequently, we propose that Wharfedale ward comprise the proposed Burley and Menston parish wards of Ilkley parish, a ward that was proposed locally and that we consider best meets the statutory criteria by reflecting local communities and interests. This results in a significantly over-represented ward with a variance of -17% by 2006, but we consider this to be justified by the support received for the southern boundary of the ward, and the position of this ward on the edge of the district and the predominately rural nature of the area, all of which leave little scope to address this imbalance. We are also constrained by the need to provide a uniform pattern of three-member wards across the district.

113 However, we have been persuaded by the evidence received that the existing southern boundary of Bingley ward should be retained. The proposed Bingley ward would therefore have an electoral variance of 12% by 2006. We consider this to be justified by the strong argumentation received regarding the community identity of Bingley town, examples of which include service provision, the use of local facilities such as the Arts Centre and geographical links.

114 We also concur that it would provide a better reflection of community identity if the hamlet of New Brighton remained in Bingley Rural ward. Consequently, we propose that the boundary

run along North Bank Road, to the north of Stoney Ridge Hospital and along Stoney Ridge Road. We also propose a minor amendment to the boundary between Bingley Rural ward and Shipley West ward to reflect access routes: the boundary should run up Cottingley Cliffe Road, but run behind Stair Foot Farm.

115 We considered the proposal to retain Harden village in Bingley ward, as proposed by five local residents. However, this amendment would result in an electoral variance of over 26% by 2006 in Bingley ward, and we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence and argumentation regarding community identity to accept this electoral inequality. We also noted the support the draft recommendations for this area received from Labour and a local resident. We are therefore proposing to endorse the draft recommendations for this area.

116 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bingley and Bingley Rural wards would be 11% and 17% above the district average respectively (12% and 18% above by 2006). The proposed Wharfedale ward would have an electoral variance 20% below the district average (17% below by 2006).

Baildon, Shipley East and Shipley West wards

117 The existing Baildon, Shipley East and Shipley West wards cover the Shipley area in the centre of the district. The number of electors per councillor in Baildon and Shipley West wards is currently 10% and 3% above the district average respectively (11% and 3% above by 2006). Shipley East ward has an electoral variance 13% below the district average (13% below by 2006).

118 At Stage One the Conservatives proposed a revised Baildon ward that included 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 around Low Springs was 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, was transferred from the existing Baildon ward to the proposed Shipley East ward.

119 The changes proposed by the Conservatives to Shipley East ward included 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 was added from Shipley West ward, and that part of Saltaire currently within Shipley East ward was transferred to the proposed Shipley West ward. Further changes to Shipley West ward involved the transfer of Lower Heaton to the proposed Heaton ward, the boundary running to the north of Aireville Road and Aireville Crescent, and the addition of the Nab Wood area from Bingley Rural ward.

120 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 and the Kings Park, Swain House and Windhill areas.

121 Bradford Metropolitan District Council's consultation scheme proposed 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 provide better levels of electoral equality.

122 We carefully considered all representations received regarding these wards during Stage One. We based the draft recommendations on the Conservatives' submission for the Shipley area with some amendments of our own. The areas to the north and south of Higher Coach Road (polling district 2H) were transferred to Shipley West ward, and we proposed that Shipley High Moor (polling district 3H) be transferred to Heaton ward. We adopted the Conservatives'

proposals for Baildon ward, with two minor modifications to tie boundaries to better ground detail.

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

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

125 At Stage Three the Liberal Democrats proposed the transfer of the small portion of Wood Lane and Kings Road from Shipley East ward to Bolton & Undercliffe ward. Labour proposed the transfer of the Dockfield Road area to Shipley East ward, using Otley Road as a boundary rather than the railway.

126 The Conservatives proposed 'the retention of Cliffe Gardens within Shipley East ward rather than transferring to Heaton' ward and 'the retention of the flats on Valley Road within Shipley East ward reflecting the fact that they are in Shipley and this sustains the integrity of the railway as a strong boundary'. Councillor Thornton also opposed the transfer of the Valley Road area.

127 The Liberal Democrats proposed that Shipley East ward be renamed Wrose ward. This is because 'with the transfer of Saltaire and central Shipley out of the old Shipley East ward, and the uniting of the Wrose area in the new ward the largest community in this new ward would be Wrose'. It also stated that 'sufficient names have been collected to petition the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister this spring for a new Wrose Parish Council' and that Shipley West ward should be renamed Shipley ward. The Conservatives also proposed these name changes, 'reflecting the dominant community in each case'.

128 We received 22 representations from Baildon Local History Society and local residents opposing the proposal to transfer the Lower Baildon area into the proposed Shipley West ward. Labour and the Liberal Democrats also opposed the draft recommendations for this area; Labour stated that 'residents identify [the area to be transferred] as part of Lower Baildon and a more logical boundary would follow Green Lane and Otley Road. This would have the benefit of connecting this single community.' The respondents argued that Lower Baildon is historically part of Baildon, and therefore should remain in Baildon ward. It was also argued by a local resident that 'we would be isolated from the Shipley ward by three main arteries, a railway, a canal and a river'.

129 We received four representations regarding the Frizinghall area from the Shipley Constituency Community Development Team, the Frizinghall Partnership, Councillor Thornton (Shipley East ward) and a local resident. They all opposed the proposed transfer of Frizinghall to Heaton ward, arguing that it had stronger links with the Shipley area. Labour concurred with this opinion. The Conservatives suggested that Frizinghall should be transferred to the proposed Manningham ward, but provided no argumentation to support this proposal. The main concern raised by these submissions appeared to be the programme of regeneration for Frizinghall, and the Frizinghall Partnership stated that 'this is serviced and supported by officers and organisations from the Shipley Constituency', which might no longer be the case if the draft recommendations were implemented. Councillor Thornton stated that 'by not including Frizinghall into Shipley this would in effect go against all the recommendations from the Ouseley Report on building community cohesion by making Shipley East a white ward, adding to the problems we are all trying to eradicate'.

130 Having carefully considered all submissions received regarding this area, we are proposing one amendment and two ward name changes. Although we have not been persuaded by the evidence received regarding community identity in the Lower Baildon area, we are proposing an amendment to the proposed boundary which would provide for a stronger and more easily identifiable boundary in this area. We propose using the boundary put forward by Labour; it should run east along Green Lane, then south down Otley Road, before running east along the River Aire to rejoin the existing boundary. We concur with Labour that this would provide a 'more natural boundary' and we consider that it would provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the existing boundary or that proposed in the draft recommendations. We received support from a local resident for the rest of the proposed Baildon ward.

131 We received opposition to the proposal to transfer the Frizinghall area to the proposed Heaton ward, but have not been persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations. Much of the argumentation received was related to the regeneration programme in the area, and this is something that we cannot have regard to as a measure of community identity. We also received one representation which argued for community identity on race grounds. As stated earlier, racial or ethnic issues can be taken into account as a component of community identity, but we do not consider that race or ethnicity, in itself, provides evidence of community identity. Therefore we require further evidence and argumentation regarding community identity to supplement that based on race. In this case we do not consider that Councillor Thornton, or any of the other respondents, has provided this additional evidence. We are therefore confirming the draft recommendations for this area as final.

132 We considered the amendments proposed by Labour and the Liberal Democrats to Shipley East ward, but do not consider that their proposals would provide for stronger boundaries than the draft recommendations. We also considered the amendments proposed by the Conservatives and Councillor Thornton to the boundary between the proposed Heaton and Shipley East wards. However, we do not consider that we have received sufficient evidence and argumentation that retaining Cliffe Gardens in Shipley East ward would provide a better reflection of community identity than the draft recommendations. In light of the proposals regarding the Sandy Lane area of Heaton, which are detailed in the previous section, retaining Valley Road in Shipley East ward would provide an electoral variance of 10% in the proposed Heaton ward and we do not consider that sufficient evidence and argumentation has been provided to justify this level of electoral inequality.

133 We concur with the Liberal Democrats and the Conservatives that the names Shipley and Wrose would better reflect the communities in the proposed Shipley West and Shipley East wards and so propose that these names be adopted as part of the final recommendations.

134 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Baildon ward would be 6% above the district average (7% above by 2006). The proposed

ShIPLEY and WROSE wards would have electoral variances 2% and 2% below the district average respectively (2% and 3% below by 2006).

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

135 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. Under the current council size of 90 members, the number of electors per councillor for Heaton, Odsal, Queensbury, Toller, University and Wyke wards is 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 respectively (6%, 2%, 12%, 17% and 12% below by 2006).

136 At Stage One the Conservatives proposed City ward contained much of the existing University ward. It included part of the Little Germany and Wapping areas, currently in Undercliffe ward. The proposed Little Horton ward was based on the existing ward and united the Canterbury, Little Horton, Marshfields and West Bowling areas. The Conservatives also proposed a Royds ward, comprising parts of the existing Odsal, Queensbury, Wibsey and Wyke wards. Their proposed Royds ward comprised the communities of Buttershaw, Delph Hill, Horton Bank and Woodside. The proposed Wibsey ward included Bankfoot, Haycliffe Hill, Moore Avenue, the Odsal estate and Wibsey High Street. The proposed Wyke ward was based on the existing ward but also united the community of Low Moor and included the Odsal Stadium and adjacent community.

137 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 running along the disused railway. They proposed a new Girlington ward, which was based on the existing Toller ward, but Daisy Hill and parts of the historic township of Heaton were transferred out of the ward. The proposed ward also included the Brown Royd and Lidget Green areas (part of polling districts 27J and 10A). Pasture Lane was transferred out of the proposed Great Horton ward, but part of the current Queensbury ward was included. The proposals for Queensbury ward removed much of the Horton Bank area and the part of Buttershaw that falls within Queensbury ward. In addition, the new ward included 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) was to be transferred to Queensbury ward. The proposed Heaton ward was also based on the existing ward and included 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 was transferred out of Heaton ward into the proposed Manningham ward.

138 The Liberal Democrats' proposed Heaton & Bolton Woods ward, to the south of Shipley, combined the communities of Bolton Woods/Owlet, Frizinghall and Heaton. The area adjacent to Whetley Lane (part of polling district 24E) was transferred out of Toller ward into the new City ward. The proposed Wibsey ward included part of Buttershaw (polling district 19H) from Queensbury ward and a section of the Oakenshaw area was removed from Wyke ward and placed in Tong ward. The proposed Thornton & Allerton ward was extended to include the Allerton and Lower Grange areas (polling districts 7A and 7B) from Clayton ward. The proposed Clayton ward included Scholemoor (polling districts 10A and 10B) from Great Horton ward. Under the Liberal Democrats' proposals Marshfields was to be united in a new Odsal ward. The proposed Little Horton ward included West Bowling (polling districts 18A and 18B) from Odsal ward. The area adjacent to Mandale Road (polling district 19H) was transferred from Queensbury ward to Wibsey ward and the Horton Bank area (part of polling district 19J) was

transferred to Great Horton ward. The proposed Queensbury ward included Mountain and West Scholes from Thornton ward (polling district 23G). The Liberal Democrats also proposed a new City ward, created around the city centre 'to solve the problem of a substantially oversized University ward'.

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

140 Having carefully considered all submissions received during Stage One we proposed broadly adopting the Conservatives' proposals for the western urban area as we considered that they used strong boundaries and provided good electoral equality. However, we made a number of amendments to the Conservatives' proposals in order to reflect the fact that we were using the railway line as a boundary. The major change to the proposed Heaton ward was the transfer of the Manningham area (polling district 11G and part of 11F) to the new Manningham ward, which is discussed in the next section. The Frizinghall area, the hospital and the Bootham Park area were transferred into the proposed Heaton ward. Shipley High Moor (polling district 3H and part of 3G) was also included in the proposed Heaton ward. The hospital and Bootham Park were transferred from Toller ward into the proposed Heaton ward. The proposed Toller ward included Parkside Grove and the sports ground (part of polling district 11F) from the existing Heaton ward to better reflect community identity. The area adjacent to Walker Drive (part of polling district 24E) was transferred to the proposed Manningham ward to improve electoral equality. As we departed from the Conservatives' proposals for this ward, we did not consider it appropriate to rename the ward Girlington as they proposed but suggested retaining the name Toller, which we considered to better reflect the local area.

141 We made four amendments to the Conservatives' City ward, which is centred on the city centre of Bradford and provided for good levels of electoral equality, to use stronger boundaries. The new ward contained the areas of Little Germany and Wapping from the existing University and Undercliffe wards and used the A650 road as a boundary. The proposed City ward also included 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 was transferred from Great Horton ward to the new Clayton ward, and the proposed Great Horton ward included part of Queensbury ward, the area of Horton Bank north of the A647 road (Great Horton Road). It also included the Haycliffe School from Wibsey ward, to tie the ward boundary to ground detail. The proposed Clayton ward comprised the existing ward, together with Clayton Golf Course and Pasture Lane. We stated that we would welcome further representations regarding Clayton ward at Stage Three as we recognised that access between the north and south of this ward was limited. Although we investigated alternative options, we felt that none of these alternatives was an improvement and, as the proposed Clayton ward was based on the existing ward to which we received no opposition at Stage One, we were content to put it forward as part of our draft recommendations.

142 We proposed that Thornton ward should include Denholme parish from Bingley Rural ward and that 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 proposed 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 was transferred out of the proposed Queensbury ward, as was the area adjacent to the southern half of Mandale Road (part of polling district 19H) in the west of the ward. We adopted the Conservatives' proposed Royds ward, with the exception that the Carr House Gate area (part of polling district 30C) remained in Wyke ward and with the addition of the Mandale Road area (part of polling district 19H) from

Queensbury ward to improve electoral equality. We adopted the Conservatives' Wyke ward with one amendment, as detailed earlier.

143 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'. We made three minor amendments to tie the ward boundaries to better ground detail. We also adopted the Conservatives' proposed ward of Little Horton, with some amendments. We proposed that Little Horton ward include the Parkside area east of the railway from Bowling ward to better reflect community identity, and that the areas adjacent to Park Road (polling district 17A and part of 17B) 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, were transferred out of Little Horton ward as proposed by the Conservatives.

144 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).

145 At Stage Three the Conservatives proposed 'the inclusion of the Chellow Dene and Daisy Hill area' in Thornton ward to improve electoral equality. They argued that 'the area is more closely associated with the community of Allerton than that of Girdlington'. The Conservatives also proposed that 'the properties on Chapel Lane and roads off ... are retained within Thornton ward' and that Lady Hill Park also be transferred to this ward to provide 'for a better boundary on the ground'. The Conservatives reiterated their proposal to rename Toller ward Girdlington ward and stated that 'we propose that the original Conservative proposal is adopted'. The Conservatives also suggested that 'a more appropriate boundary between the proposed Royds and Queensbury wards would be Cooper Lane rather than Mandale Road'.

146 Labour proposed a similar amendment, to 'keep Buttershaw estate in the Royds ward and keep the distinctly separate community of the Mandale Road area in Queensbury ward'. Labour also proposed an amendment to Toller ward, suggesting 'that the boundary with Manningham [ward] continues up Whetley Lane to Toller Lane', and that 'the boundary between Manningham and City wards follows the main roads of White Abbey Road, Drewton Road and Midland Road, rather than behind rows of houses'.

147 In the draft recommendations we requested further information regarding the proposed Clayton ward, recognising that access between the north and south of the ward was not ideal. We received no proposals to address this situation at Stage Three, but Labour proposed a change of name to Clayton & Fairweather ward. The Conservatives did comment on this ward, stating that 'it is difficult to see how the links between Clayton village and Fairweather Green can be improved but the connection is established and should be retained'.

148 Councillor Richardson (Thornton ward) proposed a minor modification to Thornton ward. He proposed that Rose Cottage and Rose Cottage Farm (in polling district 23A) be transferred to Bingley Rural ward to reflect their access routes. In addition to this, he proposed that the boundary between the two wards run 'along the centre of Old Allen Road east section, then the centre of Tewitt Lane, then across field boundaries between Bunker's Hill Farm and Rose Cottage/Rose Cottage Farm, before joining the current boundary'.

149 We received 32 representations, including three petitions with approximately 200 signatures in total, from local organisations, councillors and residents objecting to the proposal to transfer the Heaton Syke area from Heaton ward to the proposed Manningham ward. It was argued that this area is an integral part of Heaton, with a strong sense of history, and has no links with Manningham. The Conservatives supported a submission from Councillor King who

put forward amendments to unite Heaton village and so better reflect community interests and identities. He proposed that the boundary run to the south of Alum Drive, Parkside Grove and Milford Place, then to the north of Ashburnham Grove before running up North Park Road and east along Emm Lane. Labour proposed a similar amendment to 'recognise that this community is part of Heaton village and not Manningham'. Heaton Township Association stated that the proposed boundary in the draft recommendations 'severs a part of the community from its historical and social neighbours without providing a practical alternative', and suggested an amendment. Local residents pointed out that 'Heaton village amenities, i.e. doctor's surgeries, library, churches and school as well as long standing community links are all shared with "The Syke"'. A local resident commented that the draft recommendations for this area 'could be a backward step in the cause of race relations', a point that was also raised by another local resident who outlined the 'implications for inter-ethnic relations'. He stated that 'Heaton is a mixed race community whose social diversity has been harnessed by its community representatives and activists to provide a sense of local well-being.' He was of the opinion that 'much of this is likely to be placed at risk if fruitful partnerships and social networks are disrupted', and pointed out that 'Heaton has been a force for stability in the wake of the riots of July 2001.'

150 We received a submission from a local resident in the proposed Royds ward, who objected to the proposals for that ward on community identity grounds. He claimed that it would require 'political organisation to be started from scratch' and stated that there is 'no sense of togetherness between [Woodside and Wibsey]' due to 'the busy Halifax Road'. He also objected to the proposed name, Royds, as he did not believe this to provide an accurate reflection of the communities encompassed by the ward.

151 After careful consideration of all representations received, we are proposing two amendments to the draft recommendations in this area. First, we are proposing an amendment to the Heaton Syke area, based on the alternative proposals put forward at Stage Three. We have received strong argumentation regarding the links between the Heaton Syke area and the remainder of Heaton ward, based on local service provision and the existence of local community groups such as the Heaton Woods Trust. We have also received evidence from two local residents regarding the strong 'mixed race community' in this area. As mentioned earlier, racial or ethnic issues can be taken into account as a component of community identity, but we do not consider that race or ethnicity, in itself, provides evidence of community identity. Therefore we require evidence and argumentation regarding community identity to supplement that based on race. In this case we consider that this evidence and argumentation has been provided and that community identities in this area would be best reflected by retaining Heaton Syke in an amended Heaton ward. We are therefore proposing that the boundary run south down Heaton Road, to the south of properties along Milford Place and the church, around the reservoir, and then run north along North Park Road. This is an amended version of Councillor King's proposals, which we are not adopting in their entirety as we consider our proposals to better reflect access routes in the Alum Drive and Milford Place areas. We consider that this modification better meets the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations by providing a better reflection of community identity in the area without adversely affecting electoral equality.

152 Second, we are proposing to adopt Councillor Thornton's amendment to the proposed Thornton ward. We concur that it would better reflect community identity by reflecting access routes, and consequently propose adopting this amendment as part of the final recommendations. The addition of the Sandy Lane area to the proposed Thornton ward from the existing Heaton ward, and the transfer of Denholme parish out of this ward, are discussed in the previous section.

153 We are also adopting Labour's proposal to rename Clayton ward as Clayton & Fairweather ward, as we consider that this better reflects the constituent parts of the ward.

154 However, we are not proposing to adopt the Conservatives' or Labour's further amendments proposed for this area for the following reasons. We considered that the Chellow Dene and Daisy Hill area would be separated from the rest of Thornton ward by Chellow Dene Beck and considered that its transport links to Toller ward are stronger. We are therefore endorsing the draft recommendation to include this area in the proposed Toller ward. The proposal to transfer the Chapel Lane area and Lady Hill Park to the proposed Thornton ward was carefully considered, but it was noted that the Chapel Lane area is be separated from the rest of Thornton ward by a cricket ground and graveyard, whereas it adjoins Clayton ward at Grange Road. We also considered the Conservatives' proposed Girlington ward, but no new evidence was provided in support of this ward and, as we are unable to consider any ward in isolation, we are content to endorse the draft recommendations in this area as final. As a result of this, we do not consider that the name Girlington would better reflect the communities of the proposed ward and therefore propose to confirm Toller ward as final.

155 We are not adopting the amendment proposed by the Conservatives to the boundary between the proposed Royds and Queensbury wards as we consider that the area to be transferred to Queensbury ward would be too isolated from the rest of the ward by fields. Similarly, we are not adopting Labour's proposal for this area as we consider that it would isolate the properties which would lie in Queensbury ward along the southern end of Cooper Lane. Labour also proposed an amendment between the proposed Manningham and Toller wards. However, we did not consider the argumentation provided to be sufficient to justify the resultant level of electoral inequality in light of the changes already proposed for the north-west area of Manningham ward. Neither were we persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations for the boundary between the proposed City and Manningham wards, as we do not consider that the boundary proposed by Labour would provide a better reflection of community identity.

156 We noted the comments made by a local resident regarding the proposed Royds ward but, due to the lack of argumentation provided, we have not been persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations in this area. We carefully considered whether the proposed name of Royds provided a suitable reflection of the communities encompassed by the ward, and, as the name was proposed locally at Stage One and as we received no further opposition to this name at Stage Three, we are endorsing the draft recommendations for Royds ward as final.

157 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed City and Thornton wards would be 4% and 1% above the district average respectively (5% above and 2% below by 2006). The electoral variance in the proposed Clayton & Fairweather, Great Horton, Heaton, Little Horton, Queensbury, Royds, Toller, Wibsey and Wyke wards would be 2%, 1%, 8%, 3%, 5%, 4%, 1%, 1% and 1% below the district average respectively (equal to, 1%, 9%, 5%, 3% and 4% below, 1% above, 3% and 3% below by 2006).

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

158 The existing Bolton, Bowling, Bradford Moor, Eccleshill, Idle, Undercliffe and Tong wards make up the unparished area to the east of the district. The number of electors per councillor for the wards of Bowling and Idle is 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).

159 At Stage One the Conservatives' proposed Bolton ward included the industrial estate and area adjacent to North Avenue (polling district 26D) from Undercliffe ward and the area around Norman Avenue, whose 'streets fit well with the main community of Bolton'. However, the part of Wrose currently in Bolton ward was to be transferred to the proposed Shipley East ward. The Conservatives stated that the current Bowling ward is slightly oversized and so 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'.

160 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, was included in the new Idle ward.

161 The extension of the current Undercliffe ward was proposed by the Conservatives to create a new Manningham & Undercliffe ward. This included 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 was transferred to the proposed Eccleshill ward. The Tyersal and Dudley Hill areas (polling districts 5J, 5M and part of 5H) from Bowling ward were 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 and therefore there is little scope to amend the boundaries.

162 The Liberal Democrats proposed a new Idle & Thackley ward based on the existing Idle ward but with the removal of the Cote Farm West area 'to reduce the number of electors in this currently oversized ward'. The proposed Eccleshill ward included the communities of Haigh Fold and Fagley (polling districts 26J and 26K), and the two adjoining communities of Bolton and Undercliffe were combined into one new ward, Bolton & Undercliffe ward. This was bounded on the west side by Canal Road and, on the east side, by Leeds Road. It comprised 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 included the area from Lister Park in the north of the ward to City Road in the south.

163 The Liberal Democrats proposed no changes to Bradford Moor ward. The Tyersal Gate and Holme Wood area (polling district 5J) was transferred out of their proposed Bowling ward and was 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, were also transferred. The proposed Bowling ward included some of the streets in East Bowling (part of polling district 17D), bound by Balfour Street and Rhine Street. The proposed Tong ward comprised the whole of Oakenshaw (polling districts 25A and part of 30E) as well as the Holme Wood area.

164 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 resulted in significant redrawing of all other ward boundaries in east Bradford. The existing Bolton and Undercliffe wards were the two wards to be combined.

165 After careful consideration of all submissions received during Stage One, we adopted the Conservatives' scheme as we considered that their proposals provided the best reflection of the east Bradford communities and offered good levels of electoral equality. We adopted their proposals for Idle ward as they used good boundaries. However, we proposed two amendments to this ward. First, we proposed uniting West Royd in the proposed Shipley East ward. Second, we proposed that Eccleshill ward include the southern part of Thorpe Edge currently in Idle ward, taking the boundary to the south 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 adopted the Conservatives' Eccleshill ward. The proposed Bolton ward also included the industrial works east of the railway and the area of Undercliffe to the north of

the A658 road (Otley Road). It was therefore renamed Bolton & Undercliffe ward, and part of Wrose was transferred to the proposed Shipley East ward, which joined this community in one ward. These proposals resulted in parts of Undercliffe being included in two different wards, but we considered that this scheme offered 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.

166 Neither the Liberal Democrats nor the Conservatives proposed changes to Bradford Moor ward. However, we proposed using the railway line as a boundary in the south of the ward and ran 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 adopted 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 were not divided. In the north of Bowling ward, we proposed that it 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, was transferred to the proposed Little Horton ward to better reflect community identity by taking into account access to the area. The areas of Broomfields and Ripleyville, to the east of the main railway line, were included in the proposed Bowling & Barkerend ward. We adopted the Conservatives' Tong ward, with the two amendments previously mentioned. We adopted these wards as we considered them to best meet the statutory criteria by respecting local communities, using good boundaries and providing good levels of electoral equality.

167 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.

168 At Stage Three Labour proposed that the boundary between Idle and Shipley East wards should 'be drawn up Kings Road to its terminus, with everything to the east of this boundary transferring instead to Idle ward. The main road in this area is Highfield Road, which is associated with Idle.'

169 The Conservatives proposed that the boundary between Bolton & Undercliffe and Bowling & Barkerend wards 'should run from the junction of Pollard Lane with Killinghall Road along Pollard Lane and Undercliffe Lane to the junction of Undercliffe Lane with Otley Road'. This amendment was argued on the grounds that 'the historic Undercliffe Cemetery remains within Bolton & Undercliffe ward'. The Liberal Democrats concurred with this opinion, stating that 'Undercliffe Cemetery should be an integral part of Bolton & Undercliffe ward' and suggested transferring some of the streets to the west of the cemetery as well.

170 Labour and Councillors Cairns, Johnson and Ruding (Tong ward) proposed an amendment to the boundary between Bowling & Barkerend ward and Tong ward. Labour stated that 'this is to continue the boundary with Tong ward along Cutler Heights Lane' which the councillors considered 'would be a more sensible boundary'. The three councillors and three local residents supported the rest of the proposed Tong ward.

171 Labour suggested that the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward be renamed Undercliffe ward as 'Undercliffe is a clearly recognised and understood area of the city', whereas 'Bolton is not a recognised area of Bradford'. However, the Bolton Ward Conservative Branch proposed that Bolton & Undercliffe ward be renamed Bolton ward as 'the vast majority of the areas of the new proposed ward boundaries are within the Bolton area of Bradford'. The Liberal Democrats proposed that Idle ward be renamed Idle & Thackley ward as 'a petition for a new Idle & Thackley Parish Council is being prepared ... and the ward name should reflect this'.

172 We received 18 submissions from Councillor Attenborough (Eccleshill ward) and local residents opposing the transfer of the Norman Avenue area from Eccleshill ward to the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward. The respondents argued that the current boundary is the stronger one and that the area's proximity to the centre of Eccleshill should ensure that it remains in that ward. The Liberal Democrats stated that the draft recommendations 'would divide a logical and well defined community', and proposed that the Intake Road area be transferred from Eccleshill ward to the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward, that part of Thorpe Edge should remain in Idle ward and that the Swain House area should be united in Bolton & Undercliffe ward to compensate for the proposed amendment in the Norman Avenue area. Labour stated that they felt 'it would make far more sense to retain the existing boundary of Idle Road, a major thoroughfare', rather than transferring the Norman Avenue area out of Eccleshill ward, and proposed the same amendment in the Intake Road area as the Liberal Democrats. Councillor Attenborough, who included in his submission letters he had received on the matter, opposed the proposed Eccleshill ward and stated that 'there are very strong objections to the changes on the principal ground that the proposal would split a logical and well defined community into two parts'. Many local residents argued along the lines that 'this change could affect the value of our property' and that 'another concern is the possibility of house and car insurances being increased'. Another local resident stated that they 'feel certain that if you change the area into "Undercliffe" it will decrease the value of our house'.

173 After careful consideration of all the representations received at Stage Three, we propose two minor amendments to this area and one ward name change. The first modification is to the proposed Tong ward. We concur with Labour and Councillors Cairns, Johnson and Ruding that to use Cutler Heights Lane as a boundary would provide for a stronger boundary, and therefore propose including this amendment in the final recommendations. The second amendment is to the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward. We propose to transfer the cemetery to this ward, affecting no electors. However, we have not been persuaded to transfer any of the properties as we consider that this would further divide the community of Undercliffe. Finally, we concur that the name Idle & Thackley better reflects the communities encompassed by the ward and therefore propose adopting the name as part of the final recommendations.

174 We carefully considered the evidence provided regarding Eccleshill ward, but concluded that these amendments would not provide a better balance between the statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. Much of the evidence received about this area concerned insurance and house prices, issues which we cannot take into account in reaching our conclusions, and we have therefore not been persuaded to move away from the draft recommendations, which had been proposed locally at Stage One.

175 We also considered Labour's amendment to the proposed boundary between Idle and Shipley East (Wrose) ward. However, we concluded that the argumentation provided was not sufficient to justify the resultant adverse effect on electoral equality. Neither were we persuaded by either of the arguments to rename the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe ward, and we therefore propose confirming the name Bolton & Undercliffe as final.

176 Under our final recommendations the number of electors per councillor in the proposed Bolton & Undercliffe, Bowling & Barkerend, Eccleshill, Idle & Thackley and Tong wards would be 1%, 7%, 5%, 1% and 5% above the district average respectively (2%, 5%, 2%, 3% and 3% above by 2006). The proposed Manningham ward would have an electoral variance of 5% below the district average, both initially and by 2006. The proposed Bradford Moor ward would have an electoral variance equal to the district average, both initially and by 2006.

Electoral cycle

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

Conclusions

178 Having considered carefully all the representations and evidence received in response to our consultation report, we have decided substantially to endorse those draft recommendations, subject to the following amendments to better reflect community identities and interests or to provide for a stronger boundary:

- The existing Ilkley ward should be retained, and Addingham parish should remain in the proposed Craven ward.
- Denholme parish should remain in Bingley Rural ward, and the Sandy Lane area should be transferred from Heaton ward to the proposed Thornton ward.
- The area to the south of the railway in Bingley town should remain in Bingley ward, and the hamlet of New Brighton should remain in Bingley Rural ward.
- The Heaton Syke area should remain in Heaton ward, and the Lower Baildon area should remain in the proposed Baildon ward.
- We also propose minor amendments to Bolton & Undercliffe, Thornton and Tong wards and four ward name changes.

179 We conclude that, in Bradford:

- the existing council size of 90 members should be retained;
- there should be 30 wards, the same as at present;
- the boundaries of 29 of the existing wards should be modified.

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

Table 4: Comparison of current and recommended electoral arrangements

	2001 electorate		2006 electorate	
	Current arrangements	Final recommendations	Current arrangements	Final recommendations
Number of councillors	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 of more than 10% from the average	11	4	14	4
Number of wards with a variance of more than 20% from the average	1	1	3	0

181 As Table 4 shows, our recommendations would result in a reduction in the number of wards with an electoral variance of more than 10% from 11 to 4, with only one ward varying by more than 20% from the district average. This level of electoral equality would improve further by 2006, with four wards varying by more than 10% from the average, and none varying by more than 20% from the average. We conclude that our recommendations would best meet the statutory criteria.

Final recommendation

Bradford Metropolitan District Council should comprise 90 councillors serving 30 wards, as detailed and named in Tables 1 and 2, and illustrated on Map 2, in Appendix A and on the large maps.

Parish and town council electoral arrangements

182 When reviewing parish electoral arrangements, we are required to comply as far as possible with the rules set out in Schedule 11 to the 1972 Local Government 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. In our draft recommendations report we proposed consequential changes to the warding arrangements for Ilkley and Keighley parishes to reflect the proposed district wards.

183 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.

184 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’.

185 Burley Community Council stated that 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 the 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 Burley parish ward should return five councillors and Menston parish ward four councillors. This would represent a reduction in council size for Ilkley Parish Council from 21 to 20.

186 In the draft recommendations we proposed adopting Burley Community Council’s proposals as they reflected community identity and had received local support from Menston Community Association. However, we did not propose changing the council size as Ilkley Parish Council did not support this change. We also proposed modifications to Ben Rhydding, North and South parish wards to reflect the boundaries of the proposed district wards of Ilkley & Addingham and Wharfedale.

187 In response to representations received at Stage Three, we are proposing that Ilkley district ward retains its existing boundaries. Consequently, we propose that the four parish wards of Ilkley parish that lie within the existing Ilkley district ward also retain their existing boundaries. However, the warding arrangements of the two parish wards within the proposed Wharfedale ward, Burley and Menston, would be as described in the draft recommendations. At Stage Three we received support for these two proposed parish wards from Burley Community Council.

188 We confirm that the proposed Burley parish ward should return six councillors and the proposed Menston parish ward should return four councillors to reflect the increase of electors in each parish ward, as stated in the draft recommendations. In response to representations received regarding Ilkley district ward at Stage Three, we propose that Ben Rhydding parish ward return four councillors, North parish ward two councillors, South parish ward two councillors and West parish ward three councillors, with each of these four parish wards retaining their existing boundaries.

Final recommendation

Ilkley Parish Council should comprise 21 councillors, as at present, representing six wards: Ben Rhydding (returning four councillors), Burley (returning six councillors), Menston (returning four councillors), North (returning two councillors), South (returning two councillors) and West (returning three 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.

189 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. In the draft recommendations we proposed amending two parish ward boundaries to reflect changes to the district wards. These were the eastern boundary of Lawkholme & Showfield ward, to 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 did not propose to change the number of councillors returned from each parish ward.

190 At Stage Three we received no alternative proposals for this area and therefore propose confirming the draft recommendations for Keighley Town Council as final.

Final 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: Final recommendations for Bradford

6 What happens next?

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

192 It is now up to The Electoral Commission to decide whether to endorse our recommendations, with or without modification, and to implement them by means of an Order. Such an Order will not be made before 9 September 2003, and The Electoral Commission will normally consider all written representations made to them by that date. They particularly welcome any comments on the first draft of the Order, which will implement the new arrangements.

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

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

Fax: 020 7271 0667

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

Appendix A

Final recommendations for 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.

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

Map A1: Final recommendations for Bradford: key map

Appendix B

Guide to interpreting the draft of the Statutory Instrument

Preamble

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

Citation and Commencement

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

Interpretation

This defines terms that are used in the Statutory Instrument.

Wards of the City of Bradford

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

Elections of the council of the City of Bradford

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

Maps

This requires City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council to make a print of the map available for public inspection.

Electoral Registers

This requires City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council to adapt the electoral register to reflect the new wards.

Revocation

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

Explanatory Note

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

Appendix C

First draft of the electoral change Order for Bradford

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

2003 No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, ENGLAND

The City of Bradford (Electoral Changes) Order 2003

Made - - - - *2003*

Coming into force in accordance with article 1(2)

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

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

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

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

Citation and commencement

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

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

- (a) for the purpose of proceedings preliminary or relating to any election to be held on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004, on 15th October 2003;
- (b) for all other purposes, on the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004.

Interpretation

2. In this Order –

“city” means the city of Bradford;

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

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

- (a) the principal office of the Electoral Commission; and
- (b) the offices of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council; and

any reference to a numbered sheet is a reference to the sheet of the map which bears that number.

Wards of the city of Bradford

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

- (2) The city shall be divided into thirty wards which shall bear the names set out in the Schedule.
- (3) Each ward shall comprise the area designated on the map by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by red lines; and the number of councillors to be elected for each ward shall be three.
- (4) Where a boundary is shown on the map as running along a road, railway line, footway, watercourse or similar geographical feature, it shall be treated as running along the centre line of the feature.

Elections of the council of the city of Bradford

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

- (2) The councillors holding office for any ward of the city immediately before the fourth day after the ordinary day of election of councillors in 2004 shall retire on that date and the newly elected councillors for those wards shall come into office on that date.
- (3) Of the councillors elected in 2004, one shall retire in 2006, one in 2007 and one in 2008.
- (4) Of the councillors elected in 2004 –
 - (a) the first to retire shall, subject to paragraphs (6) and (7), be the councillor elected by the smallest number of votes; and
 - (b) the second to retire shall, subject to those paragraphs, be the councillor elected by the next smallest number of votes.
- (5) In the case of an equality of votes between any persons elected which makes it uncertain which of them is to retire in any year, the person to retire in that year shall be determined by lot.

(a) See the City of Bradford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979 (S.I. 1979/1634)

(b) Article 4 provides for a single election of all the councillors and for reversion to the system of election by thirds, as established by articles 8 and 9(7) of S.I. 1979/1634.

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

- (6) If an election of councillors for any ward is not contested, the person to retire in each year shall be determined by lot.
- (7) Where under this article any question is to be determined by lot, the lot shall be drawn at the next practicable meeting of the council after the question has arisen and the drawing shall be conducted under the direction of the person presiding at the meeting.

Wards of the parish of Ilkley

- 5.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Ilkley shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into six parish wards which shall bear the names Ilkley Ben Rhydding, Ilkley Burley, Ilkley Menston, Ilkley North, Ilkley South and Ilkley West; and the wards shall comprise the areas designated on sheet 2 by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by orange lines.
- (3) The number of councillors to be elected for the parish ward of Ilkley Burley shall be six, for the parish wards of Ilkley Ben Rhydding and Ilkley Menston shall be four, for the parish ward of Ilkley West shall be three, and for the parish wards of Ilkley North and Ilkley South shall be two.

Wards of the parish of Keighley

- 6.—(1) The existing wards of the parish of Keighley shall be abolished.
- (2) The parish shall be divided into fifteen parish wards which shall bear the names Bogthorn and Exley, Brackenbank and Ingrow, Fell Lane and Westburn, Guardhouse, Highfield, Knowle Park, Lawkholme and Showfield, Laycock and Braithwaite, Long Lee and Parkwood, Morton and Sandbeds, Oakworth, Riddlesden and Stockbridge, Spring Gardens and Utley, Town, and Woodhouse and Hainworth; and the wards shall comprise the areas designated on sheets 1, 2 3 and 4 by reference to the name of the ward and demarcated by orange lines.
- (3) The number of councillors to be elected for the parish wards of Brackenbank and Ingrow, Fell Lane and Westburn, Oakworth, Riddlesden and Stockbridge, and Spring Gardens and Utley shall be three, for the parish wards of Highfield, Showfield, Lee and Parkwood, Morton and Sandbeds, and Woodhouse and Hainworth shall be two, and for the parish wards of Bogthorn and Exley, Guardhouse, Knowle Park, Laycock and Braithwaite, and Town shall be one.

Maps

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

Electoral registers

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

Revocation

9. The City of Bradford (Electoral Arrangements) Order (a) is revoked, save for articles 8 and 9(7).

(a) As to electoral registration officers and the register of local government electors, see sections 8 to 13 of the Representation of the People Act 1983 (c.2).

SCHEDULE

article 3

NAMES OF WARDS

Baildon	Keighley East
Bingley	Keighley West
Bingley Rural	Little Horton
Bolton and Undercliffe	Manningham
Bowling and Barkerend	Queensbury
Bradford Moor	Royds
City	Shipley
Clayton and Fairweather	Thornton
Craven	Toller
Eccleshill	Tong
Great Horton	Wharfedale
Heaton	Wibsey
Idle and Thackley	Worth Valley
Ilkley	Wrose
Keighley Central	Wyke

EXPLANATORY NOTE

(This note is not part of the Order)

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

[The modifications are *indicate the modifications*]

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

Article 3 abolishes the existing wards of the city and provides for the creation of 30 new wards. That article and the Schedule also make provision for the names and areas of, and numbers of councillors for, the new wards.

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

Articles 5 and 6 make electoral changes in the parishes of Ilkley and Keighley.

Article 8 obliges the Electoral Registration Officer to make any necessary amendments to the electoral register to reflect the new electoral arrangements.

Article 9 revokes the City of Bradford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979, with the exception of articles 8 and 9(7).

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