

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	3
2 Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Lancaster City and rural south Lancaster	8
Morecambe and Heysham	11
Rural north Lancaster	13
Conclusions	14
Parish electoral arrangements	15
3 What happens next?	17
4 Mapping	19
<b>Appendices</b>	
A Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council	20
B Glossary and Abbreviations	23



# Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. The broad purpose of an electoral review is to decide on the appropriate electoral arrangements – the number of councillors, and the names, number and boundaries of wards or divisions – for a specific local authority. We are conducting an electoral review of Lancaster City Council to provide improved levels of electoral equality across the authority.

The review aims to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same. The Commission commenced the review in April 2012. This review is being conducted as follows:

<b>Stage starts</b>	<b>Description</b>
1 May 2012	Consultation on council size
24 July 2012	Submission of proposals for warding arrangements to LGBCE
16 October 2012	LGBCE's analysis and formulation of draft recommendations
22 January 2013	Publication of draft recommendations and consultation on them
19 March 2013	Analysis of submissions received and formulation of final recommendations

## Submissions received

We received 41 submissions during our consultation on council size and six submissions during consultation on warding arrangements. All submissions can be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and draft recommendations

### Electorate figures

As part of this review, Lancaster City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 0.6% over the six-year period from 2012–18.

We are content that the forecast data supplied by the Council is the most accurate available at this time and these figures form the basis of our draft recommendations.

### Council size

Lancaster City Council currently has 60 councillors. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed a council size of 60, no change from the existing membership. The Green group proposed that council size should be reduced to 40.

We decided to consult on three council size options of 40, 50 and 60. During this consultation we received 41 submissions, of which 10 supported a council size of 40, seven supported a council size of 50 and 12 supported a council size of 60, with seven submissions proposing an alternative council size and five making no specific proposal.

Following the consultation we considered the Council's initial submission represented the strongest evidence available for a specific number of councillors. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 60.

## General analysis

During our consultation on warding arrangements, we received six submissions. We did not receive any district-wide proposals, with some submissions making localised proposals and others not referring directly to warding arrangements.

Consequently, we have developed our own proposals for the district, based on a council size of 60 and with regard to our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations are for a pattern of five single-member, 11 two-member and 11 three-member wards.

## What happens next?

There will now be a consultation period, during which time we encourage comment on the draft recommendations on the proposed electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council contained in the report. **We take this consultation very seriously and it is therefore important that all those interested in the review should let us have their views and evidence, whether or not they agree with these draft proposals.** We will take into account all submissions received by **18 March 2013**. Any received after this date may not be taken into account.

We would particularly welcome local views backed up by demonstrable evidence. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations. Express your views by writing directly to us at:

Review Officer  
Lancaster Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG  
[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

**You can also view our draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>**

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body that conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 During our consultation on warding arrangements, we invited the submission of proposals on warding patterns for the district. The submissions received during this stage of the review have informed our draft recommendations.

3 We are now conducting a full public consultation on the draft recommendations. Following this period of consultation, we will consider the evidence received and will publish our final recommendations for the new electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council in summer 2013.

## What is an electoral review?

4 The main aim of an electoral review is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', which means that all councillors in a single authority represent approximately the same number of electors. Our objective is to make recommendations that will improve electoral equality, while also trying to reflect communities in the area and provide for effective and convenient local government.

5 Our three main considerations – equalising the number of electors each councillor represents; reflecting community identity; and providing for effective and convenient local government – are set out in legislation<sup>1</sup> and 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](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why are we conducting a review in Lancaster?

6 We decided to conduct this review because, based on December 2011 electorate figures, one ward (Ellel) has 42% more electors per councillor than the average for the district. The electoral inequality in this ward is not forecast to improve significantly before 2018.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

7 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in and which other communities are in that ward. In addition, your ward name may change.

8 It is therefore important that you let us have your comments and views on the draft recommendations. We encourage comments from everyone in the community, regardless of whether you agree with the draft recommendations or not. The draft recommendations are evidence based and we therefore stress the importance of

---

<sup>1</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

providing evidence in any comments on our recommendations, rather than relying on assertion. We will accept comments and views until 18 March 2013. After this point, we will be formulating our final recommendations which we are due to publish in the summer of 2013. Details on how to submit proposals can be found on page 17 and more information can be found on our website, [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk) You can also view our draft recommendations for the Council on our interactive maps at <http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk>

## What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

9 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)  
Dr Peter Knight CBE DL  
Sir Tony Redmond  
Dr Colin Sinclair CBE  
Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Alan Cogbill  
Director of Reviews: Archie Gall

## 2 Analysis and draft recommendations

10 Before finalising our recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council we invite views on these draft recommendations. We welcome comments relating to the proposed ward boundaries and ward names. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

11 As described earlier, our prime aim when recommending new electoral arrangements for Lancaster is to achieve a level of electoral fairness – that is, each elector’s vote being worth the same as another’s. In doing so we must have regard to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009,<sup>2</sup> with the need to:

- secure effective and convenient local government
- provide for equality of representation
- reflect the identities and interests of local communities, in particular
  - the desirability of arriving at boundaries that are easily identifiable
  - the desirability of fixing boundaries so as not to break any local ties

12 Legislation also states that our recommendations are not intended to be based solely on the existing number of electors 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 wards we put forward at the end of the review.

13 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. We therefore recommend strongly that in formulating proposals for us to consider, local authorities and other interested parties should also try to keep variances to a minimum, making adjustments to reflect relevant factors such as community identity and interests. As mentioned above, we aim to recommend a scheme which provides improved electoral fairness over a five-year period.

14 These recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of Lancaster City Council or result in changes to postcodes. Nor is there any evidence that the recommendations will have an adverse effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums. The proposals do not take account of parliamentary constituency boundaries, and we are not, therefore, able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

15 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 or wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single division or ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

---

<sup>2</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

16 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make such changes as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority ward arrangements. However, principal councils 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.

## Submissions received

17 Prior to, and during, the initial stage of the review, we visited Lancaster City Council and met with members, parish council representatives and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received 41 submissions on council size and six submissions during our consultation on warding arrangements, all of which may be inspected at both our offices and those of the Council. All representations received can also be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

18 As part of this review, Lancaster City Council submitted electorate forecasts for the year 2018, projecting an increase in the electorate of approximately 0.6% over the six-year period from 2012–18.

19 The figures were calculated based on an extrapolation of recent electorate change at ward level, with the addition of forecast electorate from a small number of future residential developments which are already underway. This means that there is substantial growth forecast in some polling districts, while others see a significant decline.

20 While the forecast electorate growth is relatively low, we note that it is based substantially on recent electorate change, and incorporates estimates of future electorate growth from residential development. We are therefore content to use the forecasts as the basis of our draft recommendations.

## Council size

21 Lancaster City Council currently has 60 councillors elected from 28 district wards, comprising seven one-member, 10 two-member and 11 three-member wards. During preliminary discussions on council size, the Council proposed a council size of 60, no change from the existing membership.

22 The Council's proposal was supported by a short letter arguing that the Council placed a priority on its community representation function. It considered that it would be difficult for councillors to adequately fulfil their representational roles under a smaller council size.

23 A further submission was also received from the Green group on the Council, arguing that there was currently a surplus of elected members and that the Council could satisfactorily manage its decision-making and scrutiny functions under a reduced council size. It also argued that a reduction in membership would enable an



increase in allowances to encourage a more diverse range of candidates to stand for election. The submission proposed that council size should be reduced to 40.

24 We considered the evidence received was not adequate to justify any specific council size, and so requested further information from the Council. A further submission was received from the Council in March 2012, providing further limited evidence for a council size of 60, highlighting the community engagement function as a corporate priority of the Council. The leader of the Green group also made a further submission arguing that the Council would be better placed to undertake community engagement if there were fewer councillors with higher allowances.

25 We decided that there remained insufficient evidence for any one council size, and so proceeded to consultation on three council size options of 40, 50 and 60.

26 During this consultation we received 41 submissions, of which 10 supported a council size of 40, seven supported a council size of 50 and 12 supported a council size of 60, with seven submissions proposing an alternative council size and five making no specific proposal.

27 Following the consultation we considered that insufficient evidence had been received for a reduction in council size and that, in the absence of substantial supporting evidence to the contrary, the Council's initial submission represented the strongest evidence available for a specific number of councillors. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a council size of 60.

## Electoral fairness

28 Electoral fairness, in the sense of each elector in a local authority having a vote of equal weight when it comes to the election of councillors, is a fundamental democratic principle. It is expected that our recommendations will provide for electoral fairness, reflect communities in the area, and provide for effective and convenient local government.

29 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The district average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the district (108,934 in 2012 and 109,611 by 2018) by the total number of councillors representing them on the council, 60 under our final recommendations. Therefore, the average number of electors per councillor under our final recommendations is 1,816 in 2012 and 1,827 by 2018.

30 Under our draft recommendations, all but one of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of less than 10% from the average for the district by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral fairness for Lancaster.

## General analysis

31 During our consultation on warding arrangements, we received six submissions. We did not receive any district-wide proposals. The Council's submission proposed that electoral equality in Ellel ward could be improved by transferring the university halls of residence from the existing Ellel ward into University ward. The submission

did not address the consequential effects of such a proposal or make reference to the other wards in the district with significant electoral inequality.

32 Two submissions proposed that there should be single-member wards across the district. We did not consider these submissions were supported by adequate evidence and so have proposed a combination of single-member, two-member and three-member wards.

33 Other submissions were either localised or did not make specific proposals. Where localised proposals were made, we did not consider they were supported by satisfactory evidence. Consequently, we have developed our own proposals for warding arrangements for the district, based on a council size of 60 and with regard to our statutory criteria.

34 Our draft recommendations are for a pattern of five single-member, 11 two-member and 11 three-member wards. In developing our proposals we have had regard for electoral equality and sought so far as possible to reflect community identities where such evidence exists.

35 A summary of our proposed electoral arrangements is set out in Table A1 (on pages 20-22) and the large map accompanying this report.

36 We welcome all comments on the boundaries and ward names we have proposed as part of these draft recommendations.

## Electoral arrangements

37 This section of the report details our draft recommendations for each area of Lancaster, with reference to submissions where relevant. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Lancaster City and rural south Lancaster (pages 8–11)
- Morecambe and Heysham (pages 11–13)
- Rural north Lancaster (pages 13–14)

### Lancaster City and rural south Lancaster

38 Lancaster City is one of two unparished areas in the wider district. The area includes the suburb of Skerton to the north of the river, while the city centre and neighbouring suburbs lie to the south. To the south of the city lies the university and the rural parishes of Cockerham, Ellel, Over Wyresdale and Thurnham.

39 The urban area of Lancaster currently comprises one single-member, one two-member and six three-member wards. South of the urban area there is a two-member University ward comprising the majority of the campus of the University of Lancaster, and a two-member Ellel ward comprising the four rural parishes. Ellel ward is forecast to have 41% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, while Duke's ward is forecast to have 21% more and University ward 13% fewer.

40 In its submission, the Council noted that the electoral inequality in Ellel ward was caused by the construction of accommodation blocks for the university which lay outside the boundaries of University ward. The Council considered that the most appropriate solution in this area was to transfer these accommodation blocks to the University ward, with which they had a clearer affinity.

41 If these accommodation blocks are transferred from the existing Ellel ward to the existing University ward, Ellel ward would be forecast to have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We consider this the most appropriate means of correcting the electoral variance in Ellel ward and so have adopted this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

42 However, this amendment results in significant electoral inequality in University ward which, with the addition of the extra accommodation blocks, would have 26% more electors than the district average by 2018. The imbalance can be improved by allocating a third councillor to University ward, but a three-member University ward consisting solely of the campus area would still suffer electoral inequality, being forecast to have 16% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

43 In order to provide for satisfactory electoral equality in the area covered by the University campus, we propose to transfer the surrounding Scotforth parish into this ward. The parish is currently detached and covers the rural area to the west and east of the university. This three-member ward – renamed University & Scotforth Rural – is forecast to have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We considered other options for warding arrangements in this area but noted that this was the only option that would not divide communities. We have therefore adopted this ward as part of our draft recommendations.

44 With the removal of Scotforth parish, the two-member Ellel ward is forecast to have 5% fewer electors than the district average by 2018. We do not propose any further changes to this ward and have adopted it as part of our draft recommendations.

45 The new boundary between University & Scotforth Rural ward and Ellel ward requires consequential parish warding arrangements in Ellel parish. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

46 In the urban area of Lancaster, we propose a pattern of wards broadly based on the existing configuration, with some changes to improve electoral equality and better reflect our other statutory criteria.

47 The city centre area is currently covered by the single-member Duke's ward, which is forecast to have 21% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

48 In order to improve electoral equality in this area, we propose to transfer the area south of the canal into Scotforth West ward. This area predominantly consists of Lancaster Royal Infirmary and large commercial developments, but also includes around 320 electors in the area of South Road and Meadowside. We consider that this small residential area has a stronger connection to areas of a similar character

south of the roundabout in the existing Scotforth West ward than it does to the city centre developments in the existing Duke's ward.

49 In the west of the city centre, we consider that the area around Lancaster Castle and areas of housing around Blades Street and Aldcliffe Road have a stronger affinity with central Lancaster than with the suburban developments to the west of the railway line. We therefore propose including these areas in Duke's ward.

50 In order to provide for improved electoral equality we also propose transferring a small area of terraced housing west of the railway line around Wingate-Saul Road from the existing Castle ward to Duke's ward. These terraces lie close to the railway station and have a strong connection to the city centre along Westbourne Road.

51 The transfer of electors between wards in this area means that Duke's ward increases to two members, while the existing Castle ward reduces from three members to two members. The two-member Duke's ward is forecast to have 6% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

52 We note that the village of Aldcliffe, which currently lies in Castle ward, has no direct road connection to the rest of the ward to its north. We consider that this village has stronger connections to the Scotforth West ward and so have redrawn the boundary in this area to incorporate it in the latter. This amendment also improves the electoral equality of the three-member Scotforth West ward. This ward is forecast to have equal to the district average of electors per councillor by 2018.

53 As Castle ward no longer contains Lancaster Castle, we consider it necessary to rename this ward. The ward contains Aldcliffe Marsh and the residential area of Marsh. We therefore propose the ward be renamed Marsh. The new two-member Marsh ward is forecast to have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

54 In the east of Lancaster, we have adopted the existing three-member wards of Bulk and John O'Gaunt and the two-member Scotforth East ward unchanged as part of our draft recommendations. These wards appear to reflect communities in the east of the city and have good electoral equality. Bulk, John O'Gaunt and Scotforth East are forecast to have 3% fewer, 4% more and 5% more electors per councillor respectively than the district average by 2018.

55 North of the River Lune, we propose a change to the western boundary of the existing Skerton West ward, to incorporate the residential development around Roeburn Drive. This residential development is accessed from its east, off the A589 roundabout, and neighbours developments in the Scale Hall area which already lie within Skerton West. We therefore consider it more appropriate for this area to be included with residential areas to its east in Skerton West ward than to its west in Torrisholme ward. With this amendment, the three-member Skerton West is forecast to have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

56 The new boundary between Skerton West and Torrisholme wards requires consequential parish warding arrangements in Morecambe and Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parishes. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

57 We propose to adopt the Skerton East ward unchanged as part of our draft recommendations, as it covers cohesive residential areas to the east of the railway line. This ward is forecast to have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

## Morecambe and Heysham

58 Morecambe and Heysham are adjoining coastal towns in the west of the district. Morecambe currently consists of four three-member and two two-member wards, while Heysham is covered by one two-member and one three-member ward, as well as part of the single-member ward of Overton. The remainder of Overton covers the rural and marshland area between Morecambe and Lancaster. Morecambe and the rural area are parished, while Heysham is unparished.

59 The largest electoral imbalances in the area are in Harbour ward and Heysham South ward which are forecast to have 19% fewer electors and 13% more electors per councillor respectively than the district average by 2018.

60 Owing to the allocation of an extra councillor to the Lancaster and rural south area and the transfer of some electors between Torrisholme ward in Morecambe and Skerton West ward in Lancaster, the overall allocation of councillors to the Morecambe and Heysham area is reduced by one councillor.

61 We received two submissions concerning the Morecambe and Heysham area, one from a councillor and one from a local resident. Councillor Rollins argued that the area should be represented by single-member wards, while the local resident argued that no change was required for the wards of Bare, Torrisholme, Poulton and Slyne-with-Hest.

62 We do not consider the evidence for moving to a pattern of single-member wards to be persuasive and the reduction in allocation of councillors to the area requires a new arrangement of wards in Morecambe. We have therefore proposed a new scheme of wards for the Morecambe and Heysham areas.

63 In Morecambe, we consider that Torrisholme ward can be reduced to a two-member ward without dividing communities in the area. In addition to the inclusion of the Roeburn Drive area in Skerton West ward, we also propose to transfer the area bounded by Broadway, Bare Lane and South Road into Bare ward. This area has a good road connection to the remainder of Bare ward along Bare Lane.

64 With these boundaries, the two-member Torrisholme ward is forecast to have 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We consider that this ward has strong boundaries and continues to reflect the community of Torrisholme, and have therefore adopted it as part of our draft recommendations.

65 As a consequence of the boundary changes with the existing Torrisholme ward, Bare ward becomes too large for a two-member ward. We therefore propose to allocate a third member to Bare ward. In order to improve electoral equality in this new ward, we propose to include an area from the existing Poulton ward, bounded by South Road, Broadway and Lancaster Road. This area is of a similar character to the

area to its east, which we also propose to include in Bare ward, and has good road access along Broadway to the rest of the ward.

66 A consequential effect of this change is that Poulton ward becomes too small to remain as a three-member ward. We therefore propose that Poulton ward reduces to two members and that an area bounded by Buxton Street, Lancaster Road and Lancaster Road Primary School is transferred into Westgate ward. This area has a road connection with the remainder of Westgate ward along Lancaster Road.

67 In order to improve electoral equality we propose that the eastern boundary of Poulton ward and the western boundary of Bare ward should run along Broadway. The residences in this area share strong connections with the remainder of Poulton ward along Marine Road East, South Road and Dallam Avenue.

68 With the new boundaries described above, the three-member Bare ward, two-member Poulton ward and three-member Westgate ward are forecast to have 4% more, 2% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2018.

69 The existing three-member Harbour ward is forecast to have 19% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We propose to reduce this ward to a two-member ward and to establish Regent Road as the southern boundary between this ward and Heysham North ward. We consider that, as a commercial street, Regent Road is a stronger boundary between the two wards than the existing boundary of Devonshire Road which is a narrower and predominantly residential street.

70 If the electors in the area between Regent Road and Devonshire Road are included in Heysham North ward, the remaining part of Harbour ward would form a two-member ward, forecast to have 9% more electors than the district average by 2018.

71 The inclusion of these electors in Heysham North ward means that this two-member ward is forecast to have 22% more electors than the district average by 2018. We therefore propose to include the area bounded by Balmoral Road, Fairfield Road and Sandylands Primary School in Heysham Central ward. This area has connections with the remainder of Heysham Central ward along Fairfield Road and is of a similar character.

72 With these boundaries, the new two-member Heysham North ward is forecast to have 4% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

73 In order to accommodate the electors included in Heysham Central ward from the Heysham North ward, we propose that Heysham Central ward should have three members. To improve electoral equality between this ward and Heysham South ward, we propose to include the residential area around Knowlys Road and Longlands Lane in Heysham Central ward. This is a self-contained residential area which appears to have stronger connections to its north than to its south.

74 We also propose to include the Belle-Aire Park Homes area in Heysham South ward rather than in Overton ward as at present. This provides for improved electoral equality and a stronger boundary along the A683.

75 With these boundaries, the three-member Heysham Central ward, three-member Heysham South ward and single-member Overton ward are forecast to have equal to, equal to, and 4% more electors per councillor than the district average respectively by 2018.

76 Our draft recommendations in Heysham and Morecambe require consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Morecambe. These arrangements result in an increase in the number of parish wards in Morecambe to 12. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

## Rural north Lancaster

77 Rural north Lancaster includes the coastal towns north of Morecambe, including Bolton-le-Sands, Carnforth and Slyne-with-Hest, as well as the rural interior of the district. Bolton-le-Sands ward is currently forecast to have 14% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

78 We have adopted the existing single-member Halton-with-Aughton ward, two-member Lower Lune Valley ward and single-member Silverdale ward unchanged as part of our draft recommendations. These wards are formed of rural parishes with strong connections and have good electoral equality. Halton-with-Aughton, Lower Lune Valley and Silverdale are forecast to have 4% more, 1% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018 respectively.

79 We received a submission from Carnforth Town Council that the Carnforth district ward should be allocated three members and be coterminous with the parished area of Carnforth. This ward would have 18% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. We do not consider this proposal provides for satisfactory electoral equality and so we have not been able to adopt it as part of our draft recommendations.

80 We considered options for including the entire parishes of Bolton-le-Sands and Carnforth in single wards to provide for stronger community identity. However, we were unable to identify options which provided for satisfactory electoral equality. We have therefore adopted the Slyne-with-Hest ward unchanged as part of our draft recommendations, including the areas around Greenwood Crescent and Whitendale Drive within the Bolton-le-Sands parish. This ward is forecast to have 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

81 In order to improve electoral equality in Bolton-le-Sands ward, we propose to include a larger part of the Crag Bank area from Carnforth parish in this ward. This is the area around Longfield Drive and Redruth Drive, accessed from Crag Bank Road to its south. This area appears to be a natural extension of the residential area around Crag Bank Road which currently lies within the Bolton-le-Sands ward. With the inclusion of this area, the two-member Bolton-le-Sands ward is forecast to have 1% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

82 With the transfer of additional electors from Carnforth ward to Bolton-le-Sands ward, the two-member Carnforth ward is forecast to have 13% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. To improve electoral equality we propose that this ward is combined with the parish of Warton to form a three-member Carnforth & Warton ward. The settlements of Warton and Carnforth have a strong road connection along Mill Lane and Warton Road. This ward is forecast to have 8% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

83 The new boundary between Carnforth ward and Bolton-le-Sands ward requires consequential parish warding arrangements for Carnforth parish. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section of this report.

84 Finally, to improve electoral equality in the areas of Upper Lune Valley and Kellet we propose to transfer the parish of Gressingham from Upper Lune Valley ward to Kellet ward. Gressingham parish lies to the west of the River Lune and has strong connections to the remainder of Kellet ward to the west.

85 The inclusion of Gressingham in Kellet ward means the single-member Kellet ward is forecast to have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, while the single-member Upper Lune Valley ward is forecast to have 1% more.

## Conclusions

86 Table 1 shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2012 and 2018 electorate figures.

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Draft recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	60	60
Number of electoral wards	27	27
Average number of electors per councillor	1,816	1,827
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	2	1
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Draft recommendation**

Lancaster City Council should comprise 60 councillors serving 27 wards, as detailed and named in Table A1 and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.



## Parish electoral arrangements

87 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 wards 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.

88 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 warding arrangements. However, Lancaster City Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

89 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parishes of Carnforth, Ellel, Heaton-with-Oxcliffe and Morecambe.

90 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Carnforth parish.

### **Draft recommendations**

Carnforth Town Council should return 12 parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Carnforth Town (returning eight members) and Crag Bank (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

91 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Ellel parish.

### **Draft recommendations**

Ellel Parish Council should return nine parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: North (returning three members), South (returning two members), University East (returning one member) and University West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

92 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Heaton-with-Oxcliffe Parish Council should return seven parish councillors, as at present, representing four wards: Roeburn Drive (returning two members), Rural (returning one member), Westgate (returning three members) and Winster Park (returning one member). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

93 As a result of our proposed electoral ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we propose revised parish electoral arrangements for Morecambe parish.

**Draft recommendations**

Morecambe Town Council should return 26 parish councillors, as at present, representing 12 wards: Bare North (returning three members), Bare South East (returning one member), Bare South West (returning one member), Harbour (returning four members), Heysham Central (returning one member), Heysham North (returning three members), Lowlands Road (returning one member), Lune Drive (returning one member), Out Moss Lane (returning one member), Poulton (returning three members), Torrisholme (returning three members) and Westgate (returning four members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

94 There will now be a consultation period of eight weeks, during which everyone is invited to comment on the draft recommendations on future electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council contained in this report. We will fully take into account all submissions received by **18 March 2013**. Any submissions received after this date may not be taken into account.

95 We have not finalised our recommendations on the electoral arrangements for Lancaster and welcome comments from interested parties relating to the proposed ward boundaries, number of councillors and ward names. We would welcome alternative proposals backed up by demonstrable evidence during our consultation on these draft recommendations. We will consider all the evidence submitted to us during the consultation period before preparing our final recommendations.

96 Express your views by writing directly to:

**Review Officer  
Lancaster Review  
The Local Government Boundary Commission for England  
Layden House  
76–86 Turnmill Street  
London EC1M 5LG**

[reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

Submissions can also be made by using the consultation section of our website, [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://consultation.lgbce.org.uk).

97 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 made during consultation will be placed on deposit locally at the offices of Lancaster City Council and at our offices in Layden House (London) and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk). A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

98 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, irrespective of whom they are from.

99 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.

100 After the publication of our final recommendations, the review will be implemented by order subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. A draft Order – the legal

document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. When made, the draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the next elections for Lancaster City Council in 2015.

101 These draft recommendations have 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.

## 4 Mapping

### Draft recommendations for Lancaster

102 The following map illustrates our proposed ward boundaries for Lancaster City Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed ward boundaries for Lancaster.

You can also view our draft recommendations for Lancaster on our interactive maps at [consultation.lgbce.org.uk](https://consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
1	Bare	3	5,664	1,888	4%	5,709	1,903	4%
2	Bolton-le-Sands	2	3,914	1,957	8%	3,623	1,812	-1%
3	Bulk	3	5,125	1,708	-6%	5,293	1,764	-3%
4	Carnforth & Warton	3	5,043	1,681	-7%	5,039	1,680	-8%
5	Duke's	2	3,781	1,891	4%	3,871	1,936	6%
6	Ellel	2	3,476	1,738	-4%	3,458	1,729	-5%
7	Halton-with-Aughton	1	1,887	1,887	4%	1,891	1,891	4%
8	Harbour	2	4,284	2,142	18%	3,987	1,994	9%
9	Heysham Central	3	5,324	1,775	-2%	5,466	1,822	0%
10	Heysham North	2	3,400	1,700	-6%	3,517	1,759	-4%
11	Heysham South	3	4,953	1,651	-9%	5,504	1,835	0%
12	John O'Gaunt	3	5,798	1,933	6%	5,679	1,893	4%
13	Kellet	1	1,893	1,893	4%	1,871	1,871	2%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council**

	<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
14	Lower Lune Valley	2	3,700	1,850	2%	3,702	1,851	1%
15	Marsh	2	3,573	1,787	-2%	3,812	1,906	4%
16	Overton	1	1,884	1,884	4%	1,898	1,898	4%
17	Poulton	2	3,826	1,913	5%	3,714	1,857	2%
18	Scotforth East	2	3,578	1,789	-1%	3,847	1,924	5%
19	Scotforth West	3	5,568	1,856	2%	5,485	1,828	0%
20	Silverdale	1	1,774	1,774	-2%	1,887	1,887	3%
21	Skerton East	3	5,158	1,719	-5%	5,111	1,704	-7%
22	Skerton West	3	5,454	1,818	0%	5,580	1,860	2%
23	Slyne-with-Hest	2	3,513	1,757	-3%	3,396	1,698	-7%
24	Torrisholme	2	3,825	1,913	5%	3,751	1,876	3%
25	University & Scotforth Rural	3	4,859	1,620	-11%	4,859	1,620	-11%
26	Upper Lune Valley	1	1,847	1,847	2%	1,853	1,853	1%

**Table A1 (cont): Draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council**

<b>Ward name</b>	<b>Number of councillors</b>	<b>Electorate (2012)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>	<b>Electorate (2018)</b>	<b>Number of electors per councillor</b>	<b>Variance from average %</b>
27 Westgate	3	5,833	1,944	7%	5,808	1,936	6%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>108,934</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>109,611</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,816</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,827</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Lancaster City 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 district. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.



## Appendix B

### Glossary and abbreviations

AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)	A landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so outstanding that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard it
Constituent areas	The geographical areas that make up any one ward, expressed in parishes or existing wards, or parts of either
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 imbalance	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
Local Government Boundary Commission for England or LGBCE	The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is responsible for undertaking electoral reviews.

Multi-member ward or division	A ward or division represented by more than one councillor and usually not more than three councillors
National Park	The 13 National Parks in England and Wales were designated under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act of 1949 and can be found at <a href="http://www.nationalparks.gov.uk">www.nationalparks.gov.uk</a>
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

PER (or periodic electoral review)	A review of the electoral arrangements of all local authorities in England, undertaken periodically. The last programme of PERs was undertaken between 1996 and 2004 by the Boundary Commission for England and its predecessor, the now-defunct Local Government Commission for England
Political management arrangements	The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 enabled local authorities in England to modernise their decision making process. Councils could choose from two broad categories; a directly elected mayor and cabinet or a cabinet with a leader
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
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