

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancashire County Council

Electoral review

November 2015

Translations and other formats

For information on obtaining this publication in another language or in a large-print or Braille version please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

The mapping in this report is reproduced from OS mapping by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office, © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2015

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	4
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Detailed divisions	9
Burnley Borough	10
Chorley Borough	11
Fylde Borough	13
Hyndburn Borough	15
Lancaster City	16
Pendle Borough	18
Preston City	19
Ribble Valley Borough	21
Rossendale Borough	23
South Ribble Borough	24
West Lancashire Borough	24
Wyre Borough	26
Conclusions	29
Parish electoral arrangements	29
3 Have your say	33

Appendices

A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council	35
B Submissions received	43
C Glossary and abbreviations	46

Summary

Who we are

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament. We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

Electoral review

An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed
- How many wards or electoral divisions should there be, where are their boundaries and what should they be called
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division

Why Lancashire?

We are conducting an electoral review of Lancashire County Council as the Council currently has high levels of electoral inequality where some councillors represent many more or many fewer voters than others. This means that the value of each vote in county council elections varies depending on where you live in Lancashire. Overall, 39% of divisions currently have a variance of greater than 10%.

Our proposals for Lancashire

Lancashire County Council currently has 84 councillors. Based on the evidence we received during previous phases of the review, we consider that retaining the council size of 84 will ensure the Council can discharge its roles and responsibilities effectively.

Electoral arrangements

Our draft recommendations propose that Lancashire County Council's 84 councillors should represent 80 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. One of our proposed 82 divisions would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for Lancashire by 2021.

You have until 11 January 2016 to have your say on the recommendations. See page 32 for how to have your say.

1 Introduction

1 This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Lancashire County Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the county.

What is an electoral review?

2 Our three main considerations in conducting an electoral review are set out in legislation¹ and are to:

- Improve electoral equality by equalising the number of electors each councillor represents
- Reflect community identity
- Provide for effective and convenient local government

3 Our task is to strike the best balance between them when making our recommendations. Our powers, as well as the guidance we have provided for electoral reviews and further information on the review process, can be found on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held a period of consultation on division patterns for the county. The submissions received during our consultation have informed our draft recommendations. This review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
16 June 2015	Decision on council size
23 June 2015	Division pattern consultation
17 November 2015	Draft recommendations consultation
12 January 2016	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations
5 April 2016	Publication of final recommendations

How will the recommendations affect you?

5 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which division you vote in, which other communities are in that division and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your division name may also change, as may the names of parish or town council wards in the area. The names or boundaries of parishes will not change as a result of our recommendations.

¹ Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

6 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Members of the Commission are:

Max Caller CBE (Chair)
Professor Colin Mellors (Deputy Chair)
Alison Lowton
Sir Tony Redmond
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

7 Legislation² states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors³ in an area, but also on estimated changes in the number and distribution of electors likely to take place over a five-year period from the date of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for the divisions we put forward at the end of the review.

8 In reality, the achievement of absolute electoral fairness is unlikely to be attainable and there must be a degree of flexibility. However, our approach is to keep variances in the number of electors each councillor represents to a minimum.

9 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors as shown on the table below.

	2015	2021
Electorate of Lancashire	899,555	930,978
Number of councillors	84	84
Average number of electors per councillor	10,709	11,083

10 Under our draft recommendations, only one of our proposed divisions will have an electoral variance of greater than 10% from the average for the county by 2021. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Lancashire.

11 Additionally, in circumstances where we propose to divide a parish between district wards or county divisions, we are required to divide it into parish wards so that each parish ward is wholly contained within a single district ward or county division. We cannot make amendments to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

12 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Lancashire County Council or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. There is no evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

² Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

³ Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

Submissions received

13 See Appendix B for details of submissions received. All submissions may be inspected at our offices and can also be viewed on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

14 As prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009, the Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2021, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2016. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 3% by 2021. Chorley, Fylde and South Ribble are all projected to have high amounts of growth in this period.

15 During our consultation on division arrangements, we received a submission from Ribble Valley Borough Council which projected a higher electorate figure than that put forward by the County Council. Ribble Valley Borough Council's proposed figures were based on a best-case scenario of housing development and occupation which included a large number of developments which did not have full planning permission at the time the forecast was made. The Borough Council forecast that the electorate for the borough would increase by 13.5% over the next five years. This compared with a forecast increase of 2.5% provided by the County Council.

16 We carefully considered the evidence put forward by both the County and Borough council. We have concluded that the forecasts put forward by Ribble Valley Borough Council appear to place too great a reliance on the speculative identification of new housing developments and do not clearly demonstrate that those developments will be fully completed and occupied within the forecast period. We considered that this forecast was not likely to be more accurate than the figures put forward by the County Council, and so we did not amend the forecast figures.

17 We are satisfied that the projected figures provided by the County Council are the best available at the present time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

Council size

18 Lancashire County Council currently has 84 councillors. The County Council submitted a proposal to retain the existing council size. The County Council demonstrated that it could operate efficiently and effectively under its proposed council size and ensure effective representation of local residents. We therefore invited proposals for division arrangements based on a council size of 84 councillors.

19 A council size of 84 provides the following allocation between the district councils in the county:

- Burnley Borough – six councillors
- Chorley Borough – eight councillors
- Fylde Borough – six councillors
- Hyndburn Borough – six councillors
- Lancaster City – 10 councillors
- Pendle Borough – six councillors
- Preston City – nine councillors
- Ribble Valley Borough – four councillors
- Rossendale Borough – five councillors
- South Ribble Borough – eight councillors
- West Lancashire Borough – eight councillors
- Wyre Borough – eight councillors

Division patterns

20 During consultation on division patterns, we received 66 submissions. We received county-wide submissions from Lancashire County Council and the Conservative Group on Lancashire County Council. We also received submissions from Chorley Borough Council, Hyndburn Borough Council, Lancaster City Council, Ribble Valley Borough Council, Rossendale Borough Council, South Ribble Borough Council, West Lancashire Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council in relation to divisions within their authority areas. The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of the county.

21 Our draft recommendations are for 80 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for good electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we have received such evidence during consultation.

22 In Burnley, we are proposing a division pattern that is almost identical to the existing arrangements, with one small change between Burnley North East and Burnley Central East divisions to improve electoral equality. All of the proposed divisions would have good electoral equality. Coterminosity would be 73% under the draft recommendations.

23 In Chorley, based on the best allocation of councillors across the authority, Chorley gains one county councillor, increasing its total from seven to eight. We received two other submissions with division patterns for the whole borough, one of which was identical to the county-wide scheme's proposals. We also received nine other submissions in relation to this area. We are adopting the majority of the divisions put forward in the county-wide scheme, with the exception of one change between Chorley Central and Chorley South divisions. This change would provide for a stronger and more recognisable boundary between these divisions, and would improve electoral equality. All of the proposed divisions would have good electoral equality. Coterminosity would be 95% under the draft recommendations.

24 The county-wide scheme we received proposed to retain the existing arrangements in Fylde. This would result in one division with 11% more electors than the county average sitting adjacent to one with 10% fewer electors than the county average. We also received an alternative pattern of divisions for the borough, as well as four other submissions which referred to specific local areas. We are proposing a

pattern of divisions very similar to those put forward in the county-wide scheme, albeit with one change which would split the parish of Newton-with-Clifton. It would result in divisions with variances of 2% and -3%. Coterminosity would be 90% under the draft recommendations.

25 In Hyndburn, we are largely adopting the divisions proposed in the county-wide scheme, with the exception of one boundary change between Accrington North and Accrington West & Oswaldtwistle to provide a stronger boundary. We received two submissions which favoured retaining the existing arrangements for the borough. However, this would have included a division which would have had 24% fewer electors than the county average. We also received five other submissions relating to specific areas in the borough. Coterminosity would be 63% under the draft recommendations.

26 In Lancaster City, we received a submission arguing that, given the recently completed review of the city's wards, the new county division boundaries should follow these new wards as much as possible. We also received three other submissions referring to specific areas of the authority. We are proposing to adopt the divisions put forward in the county-wide scheme, which in general provide for good electoral equality. In some parts of Lancaster city and Morecambe it has not been possible to maintain coterminosity without creating divisions which would have unacceptable electoral variances. Coterminosity would be 74% under the draft recommendations.

27 In Pendle, we have proposed a pattern of divisions different from the one put forward in the county-wide scheme, and different from the one put forward in a borough-wide scheme. We did not consider that either proposal would meet the statutory criteria as well as our proposed divisions. Our proposed division pattern has reasonable electoral equality and largely keeps communities together. Coterminosity would be 75% under the draft recommendations.

28 In Preston, we are proposing that the Commission adopts a pattern of divisions largely identical to one of those put forward in the county-wide scheme. Based on observations made on a visit to the area, we are proposing a different boundary from between Preston East and Preston South East. We also received a borough-wide pattern of divisions, and four other submissions referring to specific local issues. Preston will be allocated one fewer councillor than at present, which reflects the best allocation of county councillors for the county as a whole, and means that Preston will have nine county councillors. Coterminosity would be 64% under the draft recommendations.

29 In Ribble Valley, we are adopting the divisions proposed in the county-wide scheme. We received a submission from Ribble Valley Borough Council which proposed increasing the number of county councillors allocated to the borough to five, an increase of one from the present allocation. This proposed increase was based on a projected increase in electorate in the borough which the Council argued would necessitate a consequential increase in councillor representation. We received two other submissions which based proposals for divisions in the borough on there being five county councillors. As stated earlier, having considered the information provided by both the County Council and Ribble Valley Borough Council, we did not consider that the proposed increase in electorate was likely to occur in full, and so we have not increased the number of councillors for Ribble Valley.

30 Our proposals for the borough include a Clitheroe division which will have an electoral variance of 13% more electors than the county average. We considered how this variance could be reduced, by removing electors from the division in both the south and north of the town. However, we concluded that there was not a solution that would satisfactorily meet our statutory criteria. An alternative proposal put forward was for a two-member division which would include Clitheroe and a large rural area to the north of the town. We consider that this division would not reflect community identities and so we are not adopting it. Despite this electoral variance being higher than one we would usually adopt, we consider that our proposed Clitheroe division accurately reflects communities, and would provide for effective and convenient local government. Coterminosity would be 74% under the draft recommendations.

31 In Rossendale, we are adopting the pattern of divisions put forward in the county-wide scheme. It is very similar to the existing arrangements, with a small number of amendments to improve electoral equality while reflecting community identities. We also received four other submissions in relation to areas of this borough. All of the divisions in the borough would have good electoral equality. Coterminosity would be 83% under the draft recommendations.

32 We received several proposals for divisions in South Ribble. We have recently reviewed South Ribble Borough Council, and so we have carefully considered the coterminosity between the new ward boundaries and the potential division boundaries. We received three borough-wide schemes for South Ribble, which had few similarities between them. The pattern we have chosen to adopt as part of our draft recommendations will mean that nearly all borough wards are wholly contained within a particular electoral division. We consider that this is very important, to avoid creating confusion over new boundaries. This scheme also provides for good electoral equality. Coterminosity would be 74% under the draft recommendations.

33 In West Lancashire, we are adopting the pattern of divisions put forward in the county-wide scheme. Our proposed divisions in Skelmersdale are identical to the existing arrangements, with changes around Ormskirk and the west of the district to provide for good electoral equality. Coterminosity would be 84% under the draft recommendations.

34 In Wyre, another authority we have recently reviewed, we have carefully considered the coterminosity between the new ward boundaries and the potential division boundaries. We are adopting the county-wide scheme in Wyre, although it has not been possible to maintain full coterminosity with the borough wards while also meeting our three statutory criteria. This is particularly the case in the rural area. However, in the Fleetwood and Poulton-le-Fylde areas we have been able to include several wards wholly in a single electoral division. Coterminosity would be 67% under the draft recommendations.

35 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 35–42) and on the large map accompanying this report. We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations. We also welcome comments on the division names we have proposed as part of the draft recommendations.

Detailed divisions

36 The table on pages 10–28 detail our draft recommendations for each district in Lancashire. They detail how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory⁴ criteria of:

- Equality of representation
- Reflecting community interests and identities
- Providing for convenient and effective local government

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Burnley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burnley Central East	1	0%	This division comprises the community of Brunshaw as well as the eastern part of the town centre.	This division is almost identical to the existing one in this area, aside from the removal of an area between the Leeds & Liverpool Canal and Church Street. This small area will be included in our proposed Burnley North East division.
Burnley Central West	1	-3%	This division contains the western part of the town centre, and the parish of Ightenhill.	Our recommended division is identical to the existing division.
Burnley North East	1	-6%	This division comprises the area to the north-east of the town centre.	This division is identical to the existing division, apart from the inclusion of an area between the Leeds & Liverpool Canal and Church Street. This improves electoral equality in this division, as it would have had 10% fewer electors than the county average under its existing boundaries.
Burnley Rural	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Briercliffe, Cliviger and Worsthorne-with-Hurstwood, and lies to the east of the town.	Our recommended division is identical to the existing division.
Burnley South West	1	2%	This division comprises the area to the south west of the town centre and is divided by the M65.	Our recommended division is identical to the existing division.
Padiham and Burnley West	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Dunnockshaw, Habergham Eaves, Hapton and Padiham, and lies to the south and west of the town.	Our recommended division is identical to the existing division.

Chorley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Chorley Central	1	-2%	This division covers the central area of Chorley town.	This division is based on one proposed in one of the county-wide schemes we received. We have amended this division's boundary with Chorley South, in order to provide for a stronger and more identifiable boundary. Our proposed boundary follows Tootell Street, and includes in this division an area to the north of this road. This amendment means that the division still has good electoral equality.
Chorley North	1	-8%	This division comprises an area to the north and east of Chorley town, and contains a stretch of the M6.	This division is based on one proposed in both a county-wide and district-wide scheme. It is identical to the existing county division here, which is named Chorley East.
Chorley Rural East	1	-10%	This division lies to the east of Chorley town and comprises the parishes of Adlington, Anderton, Anglezarke, Heapey, Heath Charnock and Rivington, and part of the parish of Whittle-le-Woods.	This division is based on one proposed in both a county-wide and district-wide scheme. It is broadly similar to the existing division of the same name, although it does not contain the parishes of Wheelton and Withnell. In order to achieve reasonable electoral equality, these parishes are not included in this division. We also received a submission from a parish council in relation to this division, which stated that it wanted to remain in a division with its neighbouring parishes. Our proposed division ensures that the parishes remain together in the same division.
Chorley Rural West	1	7%	This division lies to the west of Chorley town and comprises the parishes of Bretherton, Charnock Richard, Croston, Eccleston, Heskin, Mawdesley, Ulnes Walton, and contains part of Coppull parish.	This division contains the rural areas of the existing Chorley West division, as well as large parts of the existing Chorley Rural West division. Our proposed division is based on the one proposed in both a county-wide and district-wide scheme. We consider that it has good electoral equality, and reflects communities in this rural area of the district and is formed of whole district wards.
Chorley South	1	-3%	This division comprises the area to the south of Chorley	This division is based on one proposed in one of the county-wide schemes we received. We have amended this

			town centre and contains part of Coppull parish.	division's boundary with Chorley Central, as mentioned above. Our proposed boundary follows Tootell Street, and moves an area to the north of this road to Chorley Central division. This amendment means that the division still enjoys good electoral equality.
Clayton with Whittle	1	-2%	This division is to the north of Chorley town, and contains the parish of Cuerden as well as parts of the parishes of Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods.	This division comprises parts of the existing Chorley North and Chorley Rural North divisions, and contains two whole district wards. It is based on a proposal in the county-wide and district-wide submissions, and has good electoral equality.
Euxton with Buckshaw	1	6%	This division comprises the Buckshaw Village area, and the parishes of Astley Village and Euxton.	This division is based on one proposed in one of the county-wide schemes we received, and contains three district wards. We consider that it has strong community identity, as it covers the Buckshaw Village development, and that it enjoys good electoral equality.
Hoghton with Wheelton	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Brindle, Hoghton, Wheelton and Withnell, as well as part of the parish of Clayton-le-Woods.	This division is based on one proposed in one of the county-wide schemes we received. Our proposed division contains the existing Chorley Rural North division, as well as two whole district wards. We did not receive any submissions which specifically referred to this area, and we are content that this division provides a good balance of our statutory criteria.

Fylde Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Fylde East	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Kirkham, Medlar-with-Wesham and Treales, Roseacre & Wharles, and a part of Newton-with-Clifton parish.	In addition to the county-wide scheme, and two borough-wide schemes, we received two other submissions in relation to this area and our proposed Fylde South division. These other submissions argued that Newton-with-Clifton parish should be kept in the same division, due to the strong community links between the two villages of Newton and Clifton. Keeping this parish within one division would result in the division having 11% more electors than the county average, which is a higher variance than we would normally recommend. We have proposed an alternative division here, which divides the parish of Newton-with-Clifton. We consider that the division has good road communication links, and that it enjoys far better electoral equality than the proposal to keep the parish in the same division.
Fylde South	1	-3%	This division comprises Bryning-with-Warton, Freckleton and Ribby-with-Wrea parish, as well as part of Newton-with-Clifton parish.	As mentioned above, we received several submissions relating to this division. We have chosen to include part of Newton-with-Clifton parish, the area including Clifton village, in this division. We observed on a tour of the area that there is a strong road link between Clifton and the rest of this division.
Fylde West	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Elswick, Greenhalgh-with-Thistleton, Little Eccleston-with-Larbreck, Singleton, Staining, Weeton-with-Preese, and Westby-with-Plumpton and part of Lytham St Annes	Our proposed division here is identical to the existing arrangements, and the submissions we received in relation to it all supported retaining the existing arrangements. This division has good electoral equality, and we are proposing it as part of our draft recommendations.
Lytham	1	-1%	This division comprises most of the community of Lytham.	Our proposed division here is identical to the existing arrangements, and the submissions we received in relation

				to it all supported retaining the existing arrangements. This division has good electoral equality, and we are proposing it as part of our draft recommendations.
St Annes North	1	2%	This division comprises the northern part of St Annes, and contains Blackpool Airport.	Our proposed division here is identical to the existing arrangements, and the submissions we received in relation to it all supported retaining the existing arrangements. This division has good electoral equality, and we are proposing it as part of our draft recommendations.
St Annes South	1	7%	This division comprises the southern part of St Annes.	Our proposed division here is identical to the existing arrangements, and the submissions we received in relation to it all supported retaining the existing arrangements. This division has good electoral equality, and we are proposing it as part of our draft recommendations.

Hyndburn Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Accrington North	1	-7%	This division covers the northern part of Accrington town, and the Huncoat area to the north-east of the town.	In addition to the county-wide scheme, we also received a borough-wide scheme. Our proposed division is slightly different from the one proposed in the county-wide scheme. We propose that the boundary between this division and Accrington West & Oswaldtwistle Central follows Hyndburn Road, as this is a strong and easily identifiable boundary.
Accrington South	1	-8%	This division covers the south of Accrington town, and the centre of Accrington.	Our proposed division here is very similar to the existing Accrington South division. This proposed division is supported by a county councillor.
Accrington West & Oswaldtwistle Central	1	-7%	This division covers an area to the west of Accrington town centre, and the centre of Oswaldtwistle.	In addition to the county-wide scheme and the borough-wide scheme we also received a submission from a borough councillor who argued that two borough wards, Spring Hill and Central, should remain together in a division. Our proposed electoral division achieves this, and has good electoral equality.
Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors	2	-8%	This two-member division contains Altham parish, as well as the communities of Great Harwood and Clayton-le-Moors.	This two-member division covers the northern part of the borough, and contains five whole borough wards. We received a submission from a county councillor who supported this two-member division, and who argued that splitting Great Harwood between divisions would confuse the electorate. We consider that this division accurately reflects community links in the area, and that it has good electoral equality.
Oswaldtwistle	1	-9%	This division comprises most of the community of Oswaldtwistle including Broadfield, as well as a large rural area in the south-west of the borough.	We did not receive any submissions regarding this division in addition to the county-wide and borough-wide schemes. We are content that this division meets our statutory criteria.

Lancaster City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Heysham	1	1%	This division comprises the community of Heysham, and the parishes of Overton and Middleton, as well as part of the parish of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe.	Our proposed Heysham division is identical to the existing division. We did not receive any submissions in this area in addition to the county-wide scheme and a city-wide scheme. We consider that this proposed division provides good electoral equality and reflects community identities.
Lancaster Central	1	-9%	This division covers the centre of Lancaster city, and contains the parishes of Cockerham and Thurnham.	This division was proposed in the county-wide scheme we received. We received a submission from a city councillor, but their proposals would have resulted in high electoral variances in this division and Lancaster South East. Therefore, we have not made any amendments to the county-wide scheme.
Lancaster East	1	-4%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of Lancaster city.	This division was proposed as part of the county-wide scheme. We have aimed to include whole city wards in electoral divisions where possible, but it has not always been possible to do so. There is only one ward which is wholly contained in this division. However, in order to achieve good electoral equality in this and adjoining divisions, we have proposed this division as part of our draft recommendations.
Lancaster Rural East	1	-7%	This division covers the large rural area to the east and north-east of the city, and comprises the parishes of Burrow-with-Burrow, Cantsfield, Caton-with-Littledale, Claughton, Gressingham, Ellel, Halton-with-Aughton, Hornby-with-Farleton, Ireby, Leck, Melling-with-Wrayton, Over	We have largely adopted the division proposed in the county-wide scheme, but with one amendment. We received two submissions from parish councils in relation to this division. One submission stated that the existing arrangements should be retained. Based on one of the submissions, we have included Gressingham parish in this division. The submission argued that its stronger community links are with Hornby, to its south, rather than with Kellet.

			Wyresdale, Quernmore, Roeburndale, Tatham, Tunstall, Wennington and Whittington.	
Lancaster Rural North	1	-10%	This division covers the large rural area to the north and north-west of the city, and comprises the parishes Arkholme-with-Cawood, Borwick, Carnforth, Nether Kellet, Priest Hutton, Over Kellet, Silverdale, Warton, Yealand Conyers and Yealand Redmayne.	As mentioned above, we have made an amendment to the division proposed in the county-wide scheme. This was to reflect evidence received during our consultation. The amendment also means that the city ward in this area will be wholly contained in the same division.
Lancaster South East	1	-2%	This division comprises the communities of Bowerham and Newlands, and the parish of Scotforth.	As mentioned above, we received a submission regarding this division and the adjacent Lancaster Central division. Our proposed division here contains two whole city wards, and part of another, and has good electoral equality.
Morecambe Central	1	4%	This division comprises the central area of Morecambe town.	We have amended the proposed division put forward in the county-wide submission, to better reflect the area it covers. This division has good electoral equality and strong boundaries.
Morecambe North	1	-5%	This division comprises the northern part of Morecambe town as well as the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest.	Aside from the county-wide scheme, we did not receive any submissions which specifically mentioned this area. We consider that this division has good electoral equality, and reflects community identities.
Morecambe South	1	2%	This division comprises the south of Morecambe town and part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish.	Aside from the county-wide scheme, we did not receive any submissions which specifically mentioned this area. We consider that this division has good electoral equality, and reflects community identities.
Skerton	1	-6%	This division comprises the community of Skerton, to the north-west of Lancaster city.	Aside from the county-wide scheme, we did not receive any submissions which specifically mentioned this area.

				We consider that this division has good electoral equality, and reflects community identities.
--	--	--	--	--

Pendle Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Brierfield & Nelson West	1	9%	This division comprises the parish of Brierfield, part of the town of Nelson and the parish of Reedley Hallows.	Aside from the county-wide scheme and borough-wide scheme, we received only one submission regarding this borough. Our proposed pattern of divisions is different from the one proposed in the county-wide scheme, and is different from the borough-wide scheme we received.
Nelson East	1	10%	This division comprises the majority of Nelson town.	
Pendle Central	1	3%	This division comprises most of the town of Colne, and part of the parish of Nelson.	We did not consider that the divisions proposed in either the county-wide or borough-wide schemes would reflect community identities, or achieve good electoral equality.
Pendle Hill	1	6%	This division comprises the community of Higherford, as well as the parishes of Barley-with-Wheatley Booth, Barrowford, Goldshaw Booth, Higham-with-West Close Booth, Old Laund Booth and Roughlee Booth, and part of the parish of Nelson.	We have proposed a pattern of divisions which seeks to keep communities together, although this has not always been possible given the need to achieve good electoral equality across the borough. Our proposals provide good electoral equality across the borough, and generally reflect community identities.
Pendle Rural	2	1%	This two-member division comprises the parishes of Barnoldswick, Blacko, Bracewell & Brogden, Earby, Foulridge, Laneshaw Bridge, Kelbrook & Sough, Salterforth and Trawden Forest.	

Preston City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Preston Central East	1	4%	This division comprises the area to the east of Preston city centre, and contains the community of Deepdale.	Our proposed division here is identical to one put forward to us in the county-wide scheme. It shares some similarities with the existing division of Preston Central North. It has good electoral equality, and recognisable boundaries.
Preston Central West	1	0%	This division comprises an area to the west of the city centre.	Our proposed division is similar to the existing Preston Central South division. It was proposed as part of a county-wide scheme and has good electoral equality.
Preston City	1	-1%	This division covers the central area of Preston, and is on the southern edge of the authority. It also contains the area around the docks.	Our proposed division here is similar to the existing division of the same name. The changes made to it are to improve an electoral imbalance. This division was proposed in the county-wide scheme we received, and has very good electoral equality.
Preston East	1	4%	This division is on the eastern edge of the city, and contains part of the Ribbleton community.	Our proposed division splits the community of Ribbleton, with one part in this division and another part in our proposed Preston South East division. In order to provide for divisions with good electoral equality in this area of the city, this split was necessary. We have, however, made a slight change to the boundaries proposed in one of the submissions we received. This is to remove two areas, one around Thornley Road and one around Sawley Crescent, from this division and include them in our proposed Preston South East division. We consider that this reflects community links in this area, and that it provides for good electoral equality.
Preston North	1	4%	This division contains the communities of Fulwood and Sharoe Green.	We have proposed to use the southern boundary of Broughton parish as a boundary for this division, in order to keep it solely covering the urban area. One submission we received suggested moving an area off Lightfoot Lane into a rural division, but we considered that this would not reflect

				community identities in this area. Our proposed division here also has good electoral equality.
Preston Rural	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Barton, Broughton, Goosnargh, Grimsargh, Houghton, Whittingham and Woodplumpton to the north and east of the city.	In addition to the county-wide scheme, we also received a submission proposing an alternative pattern of divisions for the borough, and a submission from a parish council. The parish council argued that it wanted to remain in a division with similarly rural-focused parishes. Our proposed division achieves this, and we consider that it reflects communities accurately.
Preston South East	1	7%	This division is on the south-eastern edge of the authority, and contains part of the Ribbleton community.	As mentioned above, we have adopted divisions in this area from one of the schemes we received, but with an amendment to better reflect community identities. This amendment still means that this division has good electoral equality.
Preston South West	1	6%	This division contains the community of Ashton-on-Ribble, and is on the south-western edge of the authority.	Our proposed division comprises the existing Preston North West division, and part of the existing Preston West division. This division was put forward in the county-wide proposal we received. We consider that it has strong, recognisable boundaries, using a railway line and main roads for much of its boundaries. The division also has good electoral equality.
Preston West	1	0%	This division contains the parishes of Ingol & Tanterton, and Lea in the rural area to the west of the city.	We have proposed a division here that was put forward in the county-wide scheme we received. It has very good electoral equality, and retains some recognisable boundaries of the existing Preston West division.

Ribble Valley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Clitheroe	1	13%	This division comprises the town and parish of Clitheroe, and is bound by the River Ribble on its west and north.	<p>In addition to the county-wide scheme and two borough-wide schemes, we received a submission supporting the borough-wide scheme to divide Clitheroe between two divisions. This would only have been possible with the addition of a councillor to this borough, and we are not proposing to do that. Based on the forecast electorate, the borough is only entitled to four county councillors.</p> <p>We also received a proposal to combine Clitheroe with a large amount of the rural part of the borough, in order to improve the electoral equality. We do not consider that such a division would reflect community identities, or provide for effective and convenient local government as it would cover a relatively large geographical area. We investigated whether it would be possible to remove parts of Clitheroe town and include them in other divisions to improve electoral equality. However, we considered that any changes to reflect community identities would result in a too high an electoral variance.</p> <p>Therefore, despite our proposed division having an electoral variance higher than we would normally propose, we consider that it represents the best balance of our statutory criteria. It reflects community identities, and would be very likely to ensure effective and convenient local government.</p>
Longridge with Bowland	1	6%	This division is a largely rural one, comprising the parishes of Bashall Eaves, Bowland Forest High, Bowland Forest Low, Bowland-with-Leagram,	In addition to the submissions we received relating to the whole borough, we also received a submission from a parish council in this area. It argued that it should remain in a division with similar, rural parishes. Our proposed division achieves this and has good electoral equality.

			Chipping, Dutton, Easington, Gisburn Forest, Grindleton, Hothersall, Longridge Newton, Ribchester, Slaidburn and Thornley-with-Wheatley, as well as parts of Aighton, Bailey & Chaigley and Grindleton parishes. It contains Bowland Forest Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	
Ribble Valley North East	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Chatburn, Downham, Gisburn, Horton, Mearley, Middop, Newsholme, Paythorne, Pendleton, Read, Rimington, Sabden, Sawley, Simonstone, Twiston, West Bradford, Whalley, Wiswell and Worston, as well as part of Grindleton parish.	As mentioned above, we received a proposal to combine Clitheroe with a rural area of the borough. Our proposed division here would have made up the majority of that proposed two-member division. We consider that this single-member division is a better reflection of community identities in this part of the borough.
Ribble Valley South West	1	8%	This division comprises the parishes of Balderstone, Billington & Langho, Clayton-le-Dale, Dinckley, Great Milton, Little Milton, Osbaldeston, Ramsgreave, Salesbury and Wilpshire. The division also contains part of Aighton, Bailey & Chaigley parish.	Our proposed division here is adopted from one proposed in the county-wide scheme. It comprises rural parishes, and we consider that it reflects community identities, and has good electoral equality.

Rossendale Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Rossendale East	1	-1%	This division covers the east and north-east parts of the borough and contains part of the community of Bacup.	Our proposed division here is identical to the one proposed in both the county-wide and borough wide schemes that we received. It has good electoral equality, and is very similar to the existing Rossendale East division.
Rossendale North	1	-1%	This division comprises the communities of Goodshaw, Reedsholme and part of Rawtenstall.	We have adopted the division proposed in the county-wide scheme here. The borough-wide scheme proposed a slightly different division, which would have a higher electoral variance than the division we are proposing. Therefore, we are adopting the division put forward in the county-wide scheme.
Rossendale South	1	6%	This division comprises the community of Haslingden, and a rural area in the south of the borough.	In addition to the county-wide scheme, we received two submissions in relation to this area. A local MP proposed to create a division solely based on Haslingden. The proposal would achieve good electoral equality, but it would leave the Helmshore community isolated from the community around it. We received a borough-wide scheme which proposed including a polling district in Rossendale West division rather than this division. We consider that the proposed division in the county-wide scheme has better electoral equality, and so we are adopting it as part of our draft recommendations.
Rossendale West	1	2%	This division comprises part of the community of Edenfield, as well as a part of Haslingden.	As mentioned above, we received two submissions proposing alternative division arrangements in this area. However, we are adopting the division put forward in the county-wide scheme as part of our draft recommendations because it provides for better electoral equality.
Whitworth	1	-3%	This division is largely made up of Whitworth parish, and also contains part of the community of Bacup.	In addition to the county-wide and borough-wide schemes, we received a submission from a parish council, arguing that it should remain in a Whitworth division. All three submissions favoured the same division boundaries here.

				We have reflected this in our draft recommendations, and this division has good electoral equality.
--	--	--	--	---

South Ribble Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Leyland Central	1	2%	This division comprises most of Leyland town, as well as part of the Moss Side community.	<p>We received three proposals for borough-wide schemes here, which were all very different from each other. All of them would provide good electoral equality.</p> <p>We recently reviewed this borough, and so we are keen to ensure that, wherever possible, our proposed electoral division boundaries are coterminous with the new borough ward boundaries in order to provide for effective and convenient local government.</p> <p>We have based our proposals for this borough on one of the borough-wide schemes that we received. The scheme of divisions we have adopted in the borough almost completely reflects the new borough ward boundaries, and provides good electoral equality. We consider that the proposed divisions have good electoral equality, and will reflect community identities on the ground.</p>
Leyland South	1	-1%	This division comprises the Wade Hall community and part of Buckshaw Village.	
Lostock Hall & Bamber Bridge	1	5%	This division comprises the Bamber Bridge and Lostock Hall communities, and uses the M6 as part of its eastern boundary.	
Moss Side & Farington	1	7%	This division comprises the area to the north and east of Leyland, and includes most of the Moss Side and the parish of Farington.	
Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale	1	8%	This division comprises part of Penwortham, and the Walton-le-Dale community.	
Penwortham West	1	9%	This division comprises the majority of Penwortham town.	
South Ribble East	1	5%	This division comprises the rural area in the east of the borough, and includes the parishes of Cuerdale and	

			Samlesbury, as well as Gregson Lane.	
South Ribble West	1	4%	This division comprises the rural area in the west of the borough, and includes the parishes of Hutton, Little Hoole, Longton, and Much Hoole.	

West Lancashire Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burscough & Rufford	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Burscough and Rufford and part of Scarisbrick parish.	The county-wide and borough-wide schemes we received each proposed identical divisions for this area. The division's boundaries are also identical to the existing division which has good electoral equality.
Ormskirk	1	-1%	This division comprises the majority of Ormskirk town.	We have adopted this division from one proposed in the county-wide scheme, although we have changed the name to Ormskirk to better reflect the make-up of the division. The proposed division in the borough-wide scheme did not reflect community identities, as it would have poor internal road and communication links.
Skelmersdale Central	1	0%	This division comprises the centre of Skelmersdale, and has the M58 as part of its southern boundary.	The county-wide scheme and borough-wide schemes proposed identical divisions for Skelmersdale. Our proposed divisions here are also identical to the existing divisions in this area. All three have good electoral equality and reflect local community identities.
Skelmersdale East	1	1%	This division covers the east of Skelmersdale town, and also contains the parishes of Up Holland and Wrightington.	
Skelmersdale West	1	0%	This division comprises the western and northern parts of Skelmersdale town.	

West Lancashire East	1	-3%	This division comprises the parishes of Bickerstaffe, Bispham, Dalton, Hilldale, Lathom, Lathom South, Newburgh, Parbold and Simonswood, and part of Aughton parish as well as part of Ormskirk town.	In addition to the county-wide and borough-wide schemes, we received a submission from a parish in this division. The parish stated that it had stronger ties to the parishes outside Skelmersdale, and that it did not want to be part of a mainly urban-focused division. We have achieved this in our proposed division which will also have good electoral equality.
West Lancashire North	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Hesketh-with-Beaconsall, North Meols and Tarleton.	The county-wide and borough-wide schemes we received each proposed identical divisions in this area. The division's boundaries are also identical to the existing division here, and the division has good electoral equality.
West Lancashire West	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Downholland, Great Altcar and Halsall, as well as parts of Aughton and Scarisbrick parishes.	We have adopted this division from one proposed in the county-wide scheme. We consider that it reflects community identities, and has good electoral equality.

Wyre Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Cleveleys East	1	-6%	This division comprises part of Cleveleys, and part of Thornton.	Our proposed division here is similar to those proposed in the county-wide and borough-wide schemes that we received. We have made one amendment to the boundary between this proposed division and Thornton & Hambleton. This change will mean that all of Bourne borough ward is contained in this division and improves electoral equality here. We also consider that our proposed division follows clear and recognisable boundaries.
Cleveleys South & Carleton	1	-8%	This division comprises parts of Cleveleys, Thornton and Carleton.	Our proposed division is identical to the one proposed in the borough-wide schemes. We considered that the division proposed in the county-wide scheme would not provide for

				effective and convenient local government, as there would be an unnecessary split of Thornton between two divisions.
Fleetwood East	1	-3%	This division comprises the north and east of Fleetwood town, and uses the River Wyre as its eastern boundary.	Our proposed divisions here are identical to the ones put forward in the county-wide and borough-wide schemes. They have good electoral equality and are formed of whole borough wards. The divisions both have good electoral equality.
Fleetwood West & Cleveleys West	1	4%	This division comprises the majority of Fleetwood town, and the western part of Cleveleys.	
Poulton-le-Fylde	1	2%	This division contains the town of Poulton-le-Fylde.	In addition to the county-wide and borough-wide proposals, we received one submission regarding this area. It argued in favour of retaining the existing division and to reflect the new borough ward boundaries in the division boundaries. Our proposed division here is identical to the existing division. We consider that this division reflects community identities, and will provide good electoral equality.
Thornton & Hambleton	1	-7%	This division contains much of the community of Thornton, and the parishes of Hambleton, Out Rawcliffe, and Stalmine-with-Staynall.	In addition to the county-wide and borough-wide proposals, we received a submission favouring including all of Preesall parish in the same division, in order to reflect community links. Our proposed division reflects this, and achieves good electoral equality.
Wyre Rural Central	1	7%	This division contains the parishes of Forton, Great Eccleston, Inskip-with-Sowerby, Myerscough & Bilsborrow, Nateby, Preesall, Pilling, Upper Rawcliffe-with-Tarnacre and Winmarleigh.	As mentioned above, we received a submission regarding Preesall parish, which favoured keeping the parish together in the same division. We have included this parish entirely in Wyre Rural Central division. One of the borough-wide schemes we received proposed a significant split of Garstang town between these divisions. We do not consider that this would accurately reflect community identities, or provide for effective and convenient local government. We have kept Garstang town together in the same division (Wyre Rural East) with the exception of a small part of Nateby parish which is within the built-up area of Garstang. Both divisions have reasonable electoral equality. We
Wyre Rural East	1	-9%	This division comprises the parishes of Barnacre-with-Bonds, Bleasdale, Cabus, Catterall, Claughton,	

			Garstang, Kirkland and Nether Wyresdale.	received a submission from a parish in this area which argued that it wanted to remain in a division with Garstang. However, including this parish in our Wyre Rural East division would result in an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality.
--	--	--	--	--

Conclusions

37 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2015 and 2021 electorate figures.

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	84	84
Number of electoral divisions	82	82
Average number of electors per councillor	10,709	11,083
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	5	1
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Draft recommendation
 Lancashire County Council should comprise 84 councillors serving 80 single-member divisions and two two-member divisions. The details and names are shown in Table A1 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

Mapping
Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Lancashire. You can also view our draft recommendations for Lancashire on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

Parish electoral arrangements

38 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different divisions it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

39 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority division arrangements. However, the district councils in Lancashire have powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

40 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley, Aughton, Colne, Grindleton, Lea, Nelson, Newton-with-Clifton, Penwortham and Scarisbrook parishes.

41 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley parish.

Draft recommendation

Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley Parish Council should return six parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Chaigley (returning two members) and Hurst Green & Stonyhurst (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

42 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Aughton parish.

Draft recommendation

Aughton Parish Council should return 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Aughton North-East (returning two members), Aughton Park (returning four members) and Aughton South (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

43 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Colne parish.

Draft recommendation

Colne Parish Council should return 17 parish councillors, as at present, representing seven wards: Castle Road (returning one member), Central (returning three members), Horsfield (returning one member), South East (returning two members), Vivary Bridge (returning five members), Waterside East (returning one member) and Waterside West (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

44 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Grindleton parish.

Draft recommendation

Grindleton Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Grindleton North (returning one member) and Grindleton South (returning six members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

45 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory

criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Lea parish.

Draft recommendation

Lea Parish Council should return 14 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Cottam (returning seven members), Lea (returning six members) and Lea Town (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

46 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Nelson parish.

Draft recommendation

Nelson Parish Council should return 24 parish councillors, as at present, representing eight wards: Bradley North (returning four members), Bradley South (returning one member), Clover Hill (returning four members), Marsden East (returning two members), Marsden West (returning two members), Southfield (returning five members), Walverden (returning three members) and Whitefield (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

47 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Newton-with-Clifton parish.

Draft recommendation

Newton-with-Clifton Parish Council should return 11 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Clifton (returning four members) and Newton (returning seven members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

48 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Penwortham parish.

Draft recommendation

Penwortham Town Council should return 18 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Broad Oak (returning three members), Charnock (returning four members), Howick and Priory (returning five members), Middleforth North (returning two members) and Middleforth South (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

49 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Scarisbrick parish.

Draft recommendation

Scarisbrick Parish Council should return 10 parish councillors, as at present, representing three wards: Scarisbrick North-East (returning three members), Scarisbrick North-West (returning five members) and Scarisbrick South (returning two members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

3 Have your say

50 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of whom it is from or whether it relates to the whole county or just a part of it.

51 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Lancashire, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of divisions.

52 Our website has a special consultation area where you can explore the maps and draw your own proposed boundaries. You can find it at consultation.lgbce.org.uk

Submissions can also be made by emailing reviews@lgbce.org.uk or by writing to:

Review Officer (Lancashire)
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
14th Floor Millbank Tower
London
SW1P 4QP

The Commission aims to propose a pattern of divisions for Lancashire which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of voters
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively

A good pattern of divisions should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of voters
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government

Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?

Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed divisions too large or small to be represented effectively?

- Are the proposed names of the divisions appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed divisions? Is there any form of public transport?

53 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices at Millbank Tower (London) and on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

54 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers, such as postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

55 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

56 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Lancashire County Council in 2017.

Equalities

57 This report has been screened for impact on equalities; with due regard being given to the general equalities duties as set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. As no potential negative impacts were identified, a full equality impact analysis is not required.

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Burnley Borough								
1	Burnley Central East	1	11,132	11,132	4%	11,073	11,073	0%
2	Burnley Central West	1	10,831	10,831	1%	10,773	10,773	-3%
3	Burnley North East	1	10,491	10,491	-2%	10,435	10,435	-6%
4	Burnley Rural	1	11,338	11,338	6%	11,278	11,278	2%
5	Burnley South West	1	11,388	11,388	6%	11,327	11,327	2%
6	Padiham & Burnley West	1	10,591	10,591	-1%	10,535	10,535	-5%
Chorley Borough								
7	Chorley Central	1	10,839	10,839	1%	10,895	10,895	-2%
8	Chorley North	1	10,124	10,124	-5%	10,198	10,198	-8%
9	Chorley Rural East	1	9,433	9,433	-12%	9,928	9,928	-10%
10	Chorley Rural West	1	11,731	11,731	10%	11,805	11,805	7%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11	Chorley South	1	10,274	10,274	-4%	10,779	10,779	-3%
12	Clayton with Whittle	1	10,013	10,013	-6%	10,859	10,859	-2%
13	Euxton with Buckshaw	1	11,048	11,048	3%	11,781	11,781	6%
14	Hoghton with Wheelton	1	10,301	10,301	-4%	10,242	10,242	-8%
Fylde Borough								
15	Fylde East	1	9,993	9,993	-7%	11,314	11,314	2%
16	Fylde South	1	9,641	9,641	-10%	10,771	10,771	-3%
17	Fylde West	1	10,198	10,198	-5%	11,682	11,682	5%
18	Lytham	1	10,669	10,669	0%	11,007	11,007	-1%
19	St Annes North	1	10,451	10,451	-2%	11,314	11,314	2%
20	St Annes South	1	10,506	10,506	-2%	11,872	11,872	7%
Hyndburn Borough								
21	Accrington North	1	10,240	10,240	-4%	10,317	10,317	-7%
22	Accrington South	1	10,115	10,115	-6%	10,206	10,206	-8%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
23	Accrington West & Oswaldtwistle Central	1	10,142	10,142	-5%	10,259	10,259	-7%
24	Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors	2	20,140	10,070	-6%	20,312	10,156	-8%
25	Oswaldtwistle	1	10,103	10,103	-6%	10,103	10,103	-9%
Lancaster City								
26	Heysham	1	11,165	11,165	4%	11,243	11,243	1%
27	Lancaster Central	1	10,046	10,046	-6%	10,117	10,117	-9%
28	Lancaster East	1	10,575	10,575	-1%	10,649	10,649	-4%
29	Lancaster Rural East	1	10,257	10,257	-4%	10,329	10,329	-7%
30	Lancaster Rural North	1	9,888	9,888	-8%	9,957	9,957	-10%
31	Lancaster South East	1	10,826	10,826	1%	10,902	10,902	-2%
32	Morecambe Central	1	11,403	11,403	6%	11,483	11,483	4%
33	Morecambe North	1	10,486	10,486	-2%	10,560	10,560	-5%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
34	Morecambe South	1	11,177	11,177	4%	11,255	11,255	2%
35	Skerton	1	10,399	10,399	-3%	10,472	10,472	-6%
Pendle Borough								
36	Brierfield & Nelson West	1	11,503	11,503	7%	12,057	12,057	9%
37	Nelson East	1	11,755	11,755	10%	12,142	12,142	10%
38	Pendle Central	1	10,827	10,827	1%	11,382	11,382	3%
39	Pendle Hill	1	11,166	11,166	4%	11,761	11,761	6%
40	Pendle Rural	2	21,342	10,671	0%	22,411	11,205	1%
Preston City								
41	Preston Central East	1	11,345	11,345	6%	11,541	11,541	4%
42	Preston Central West	1	11,095	11,095	4%	11,134	11,134	0%
43	Preston City	1	10,974	10,974	2%	11,012	11,012	-1%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
44	Preston East	1	11,452	11,452	7%	11,493	11,493	4%
45	Preston North	1	11,384	11,384	6%	11,542	11,542	4%
46	Preston Rural	1	9,164	9,164	-14%	10,678	10,678	-4%
47	Preston South East	1	11,819	11,819	10%	11,875	11,875	7%
48	Preston South West	1	11,552	11,552	8%	11,737	11,737	6%
49	Preston West	1	10,616	10,616	-1%	11,076	11,076	0%
Ribble Valley Borough								
50	Clitheroe	1	12,253	12,253	14%	12,531	12,531	13%
51	Longridge with Bowland	1	11,499	11,499	7%	11,773	11,773	6%
52	Ribble Valley North East	1	11,601	11,601	8%	11,994	11,994	8%
53	Ribble Valley South West	1	11,746	11,746	10%	11,999	11,999	8%
Rossendale Borough								
54	Rossendale East	1	10,505	10,505	-2%	11,005	11,005	-1%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
55	Rossendale North	1	10,369	10,369	-3%	10,941	10,941	-1%
56	Rossendale South	1	11,217	11,217	5%	11,769	11,769	6%
57	Rossendale West	1	10,822	10,822	1%	11,295	11,295	2%
58	Whitworth	1	10,228	10,228	-4%	10,757	10,757	-3%
South Ribble Borough								
59	Leyland Central	1	11,106	11,106	4%	11,324	11,324	2%
60	Leyland South	1	10,486	10,486	-2%	10,932	10,932	-1%
61	Lostock Hall & Bamber Bridge	1	11,448	11,448	7%	11,642	11,642	5%
62	Moss Side & Farington	1	9,326	9,326	-13%	11,866	11,866	7%
63	Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale	1	10,395	10,395	-3%	11,920	11,920	8%
64	Penwortham West	1	11,871	11,871	11%	12,042	12,042	9%
65	South Ribble East	1	10,515	10,515	-2%	11,667	11,667	5%
66	South Ribble West	1	10,983	10,983	3%	11,518	11,518	4%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
West Lancashire Borough								
67	Burscough & Rufford	1	9,989	9,989	-7%	10,397	10,397	-6%
68	Ormskirk	1	10,800	10,800	1%	11,000	11,000	-1%
69	Skelmersdale Central	1	10,869	10,869	1%	11,105	11,105	0%
70	Skelmersdale East	1	10,865	10,865	1%	11,143	11,143	1%
71	Skelmersdale West	1	10,738	10,738	0%	11,044	11,044	0%
72	West Lancashire East	1	10,603	10,603	-1%	10,748	10,748	-3%
73	West Lancashire North	1	10,998	10,998	3%	11,588	11,588	5%
74	West Lancashire West	1	10,349	10,349	-3%	10,615	10,615	-4%
Wyre Borough								
75	Cleveleys East	1	10,067	10,067	-6%	10,448	10,448	-6%
76	Cleveleys South & Carleton	1	10,015	10,015	-6%	10,244	10,244	-8%
77	Fleetwood East	1	10,362	10,362	-3%	10,698	10,698	-3%

Table A1 (cont.): Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
78	Fleetwood West & Cleveleys West	1	11,204	11,204	5%	11,513	11,513	4%
79	Poulton-le-Fylde	1	10,994	10,994	3%	11,339	11,339	2%
80	Thornton & Hambleton	1	10,034	10,034	-6%	10,306	10,306	-7%
81	Wyre Rural Central	1	11,563	11,563	8%	11,898	11,898	7%
82	Wyre Rural East	1	9,787	9,787	-9%	10,044	10,044	-9%
	Totals	84	899,555	–	–	930,978	–	–
	Averages	–	–	10,709	–	–	11,083	–

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lancashire County Council.

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/north-west/lancashire/lancashire-county-council>

Local authority

- Lancashire County Council

District councils

- Chorley Borough Council
- Hyndburn Borough Council
- Lancaster City Council
- Ribble Valley Borough Council
- Rossendale Borough Council
- South Ribble Borough Council
- West Lancashire Borough Council
- Wyre Borough Council

MPs

- Nigel Evans MP
- Mark Hendrick MP
- Graham Jones MP

County councillors

- Councillor M. Boardman
- Councillor A. Clempson
- Councillor M. Dad
- Councillor B. Dawson
- Councillor G. Molineux
- Councillor M. Perks

District councillors

- Councillor K. Martin
- Councillor A. Mills

Political groups and parties

- Chorley Conservative Association
- Lancashire County Council Conservative Group
- Lancashire County Council Independent Group
- Lancashire County Council Labour Group

- South Ribble Borough Council Conservative Group
- South Ribble Borough Council Labour Group
- Ribble Valley Conservative Association
- Rossendale & Darwen Conservative Association
- Wyre Borough Council Labour Group

Parish and town councils

- Anderton Parish Council
- Aughton Parish Council
- Barrow Parish Council
- Bowland Forest High Parish Council
- Bretherton Parish Council
- Charnock Richard Parish Council
- Farington Parish Council
- Foulridge Parish Council
- Freckleton Parish Council
- Gressingham Parish Council
- Grimsargh Parish Council
- Inskip-with-Sowerby Parish Council
- Lathom South Parish Council
- Little Eccleston with Larbreck Parish Council
- Longton Parish Council
- Myerscough & Bilsborrow Parish Council
- Nateby Parish Council
- Newton-with-Clifton Parish Council
- Penwortham Town Council
- Preesall Town Council
- St Anne's on the Sea Town Council
- Wheelton Parish Council
- Whitworth Town Council
- Wrightington Parish Council

Parish councillor

- Cllr T Young

Local organisations

- Lancashire Fire & Rescue Service
- Newton Residents' Association
- Rishton Prospect Panel
- Scaitcliffe & Spring Hill Neighbourhood Management
- St Matthew & St James Church, Preston
- Thornton Action Group
- West Lancashire Clinical Commissioning Group

Local residents

- Five local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral fairness	When one elector's vote is worth the same as another's
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. For the purposes of this report, we refer specifically to the electorate for local government elections
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average

Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents
Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at www.nalc.gov.uk
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council