

# Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	4
2 Analysis and final recommendations	6
Submissions received	6
Electorate figures	6
Council size	6
Electoral fairness	7
General analysis	7
Electoral arrangements	8
Morecambe and Heysham	8
Rural north Lancaster	11
Lancaster city and rural south Lancaster	14
Conclusions	16
Parish electoral arrangements	16
3 What happens next?	18
4 Mapping	19
<b>Appendices</b>	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Lancaster City Council	20
B Glossary and abbreviations	23



## Summary

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which 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	Invitation to submit 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
4 June 2013	Further limited consultation on revised proposals in two areas
16 July 2013	Analysis of further consultation submissions and confirmation of final recommendations

## Draft recommendations

We proposed a council size of 60 members, comprising a pattern of five single-member wards, 11 two-member wards and 11 three-member wards. We did not receive any district-wide proposals during our consultation on warding arrangements, so based our draft recommendations on our own proposals, taking account of localised evidence and having regard to our statutory criteria. Our draft recommendations for Lancaster City Council sought to reflect the evidence of community identities received while ensuring good electoral equality and providing for effective and convenient local government.

## Submissions received

During the consultation on our draft recommendations, the Commission received 43 submissions, including comments on our proposals in Morecambe, Heysham, the Carnforth area and the rural part of the district. The City Council made general comments on our proposals, while Lancaster District Labour Party made an alternative proposal for ward boundaries in Morecambe and Heysham. We also received submissions from eight parish and town councils, five other councillors and political groups, and 28 local residents. Of the submissions from residents, 23 were copies of an identical proforma letter objecting to our proposals for Morecambe.

Following analysis of submissions received, we considered that it may be appropriate to make changes to our proposals in the areas of Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth. Owing to the significance of the proposed changes, we decided to conduct further limited consultation in these two areas. We received eight submissions during the further limited consultation, including three from district councillors, four from parish and town councils and one from a local resident. All submissions can be viewed on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Analysis and final recommendations

### Electorate figures

Lancaster City Council ('the Council') submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. These forecasts projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 0.6% over this period. We are content that the forecasts are the most accurate available at this time and have used these figures as the basis of our final recommendations.

### General analysis

Throughout the review process, the primary consideration has been to achieve good electoral equality, while seeking to reflect community identities and securing effective and convenient local government. Having considered the submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations and during the further limited consultation, we have sought to reflect community identities and improve levels of electoral fairness.

Our final recommendations take account of submissions received during consultation on our draft recommendations and during the further limited consultation on our revised proposals in the Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth areas. As a result, we have proposed amendments to ward boundaries in Morecambe, Heysham, Carnforth, Bolton-le-Sands, Slyne-with-Hest and Upper Lune Valley. We have also proposed a ward name change in the Lancaster city area.

Our final recommendations for Lancaster are that the Council should have 60 members, with six single-member, nine two-member and 12 three-member wards. Two of the wards would have an electoral variance of greater than 10% by 2018.

### What happens next?

We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament and will be implemented subject to Parliamentary scrutiny. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Lancaster City Council in 2015.

We are grateful to all those organisations and individuals who have contributed to the review through expressing their views and advice. The full report is available to download at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

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

# 1 Introduction

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body which conducts electoral reviews of local authority areas. This electoral review is being conducted following our decision to review Lancaster City Council's electoral arrangements to ensure that the number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the authority.

2 Our *Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council* were published on 22 January 2013. We then undertook a further period of consultation which ended on 18 March 2013. Following consideration of the evidence received, we commenced a further limited consultation on revised proposals in two areas of the district on 4 June 2013. This consultation concluded on 15 July 2013.

## What is an electoral review?

3 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.

4 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?

5 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?

6 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some instances, which parish council wards you vote in. Your ward 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.

---

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

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

7 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 final recommendations

### Submissions received

8 Prior to, and during, the initial stages of the review, we visited Lancaster City Council ('the Council') and met with members and officers. We are grateful to all concerned for their co-operation and assistance. We received six submissions during the consultation on warding patterns, 43 submissions during the consultation on our draft recommendations, and eight submissions during the further limited consultation. All of the submissions 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

9 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2018, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2013. This is prescribed in the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 ('the 2009 Act'). These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and projected an increase in the electorate of approximately 0.6% to 2018.

10 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.

11 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 final recommendations.

### Council size

12 Lancaster currently has 60 councillors elected from 28 wards. During the preliminary stage of the review, we met with Group Leaders and Full Council. The Council subsequently made a proposal for a council size of 60, no change from the existing membership.

13 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.

14 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.



15 We considered the evidence received was not adequate to justify a 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.

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

17 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.

18 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 final recommendations on a council size of 60.

## Electoral fairness

19 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.

20 In seeking to achieve electoral fairness, we work out the average number of electors per councillor. The city average is calculated by dividing the total electorate of the city (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.

21 Under our final recommendations, two of our proposed wards will have electoral variances of more than 10% from the average for the city by 2018. We are therefore satisfied that we have achieved good levels of electoral equality for Lancaster.

## General analysis

22 During consultation on the draft recommendations for Lancaster, we received 43 submissions. The majority of the submissions related to our proposals in Morecambe and in the Carnforth area.

23 The City Council made general comments on our draft recommendations and objected to proposed ward boundaries in the Carnforth area, though it did not propose a specific alternative. An alternative scheme for part of the Morecambe and Heysham area was proposed by the Lancaster District Labour Party.

24 We also received submissions from eight parish and town councils, five other councillors and political groups, and 28 local residents. Of the submissions from residents, 23 were copies of an identical proforma letter objecting to our proposals for Morecambe.

25 Following consideration of the evidence received in the Morecambe and Carnforth areas, we considered that amended boundaries in these areas may better reflect our statutory criteria. Owing to the significance of the proposed changes, we decided to conduct a period of further limited consultation, inviting comment on the revised proposals in these two areas.

26 During the further limited consultation we received eight submissions. Three submissions objected to the proposal to combine the towns of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest in a three-member Bolton-le-Sands ward. Two submissions were received concerning the proposed Canforth & Warton ward. One submission favoured the proposal while the other was opposed. Finally, three submissions were received with regard to Morecambe and Heysham, of which one was supportive while the other two made no comment on the revised proposals.

27 We do not consider that the evidence received during the further limited consultation adds substantially to the evidence previously received with regard to our draft recommendations.

28 We consider the evidence suggests our revised proposals in the Carnforth and Morecambe areas provide the best reflection of our statutory criteria. We have therefore adopted the revised proposals in these areas as part of our final recommendations.

29 Following evidence received during the consultation on our draft recommendations, we also propose to change the name of one ward in the Lancaster city area and that the boundary between Kellet and Upper Lune Valley ward be amended so that the parish of Gressingham is included in the latter.

## Electoral arrangements

30 This section of the report details the proposals we have received, our consideration of them, and our final recommendations for each area of Lancaster. The following areas of the authority are considered in turn:

- Morecambe and Heysham (pages 8–11)
- Rural north Lancaster (pages 11–14)
- Lancaster city and rural south Lancaster (pages 14–16)

31 Details of the final recommendations are set out in Table A1 on pages 20–2 and illustrated on the large map accompanying this report.

### Morecambe and Heysham

32 Morecambe and Heysham are neighbouring coastal towns in the west of the district. In our draft recommendations, we proposed a new scheme of wards for the towns to reflect a reduction in their allocation of councillors. The proposals were for

four two-member and four three-member wards in the urban areas and for a single-member Overton ward covering the rural area to the south of the towns.

33 Objections were received to our draft recommendations from Morecambe Town Council, from the independent Group on the City Council, from a district councillor and from 25 local residents. In addition, the Lancaster District Labour Party proposed alternative boundaries for the wards of Harbour, Heysham North, Heysham Central, Heysham South and Overton.

34 The Independent Group and Morecambe Town Council both proposed that the draft recommendations for the Morecambe area should not be adopted and that there should be a reversion to existing boundaries, with warding changes focusing instead on the Lancaster city area. They also argued that Morecambe was being unfairly under-represented by comparison with Lancaster, while the Town Council also objected to the consequential parish warding arrangements for the district.

35 These arguments were supported in a proforma letter signed by 23 local residents. Another resident also argued that the current ward boundaries were satisfactory and did not require amendment.

36 None of the above submissions addressed how maintaining the existing boundaries of wards in the Morecambe and Heysham area would provide for a better reflection of our statutory criteria than the draft recommendations. We also consider that the area has received the proper allocation of councillors based on both existing and forecast electorate figures.

37 We therefore confirm the decision to reduce the allocation of members for this area by one councillor. As a consequence, we have not accepted the proposals from the Town Council and Independent Group to revert to existing ward boundaries in Morecambe and Heysham.

38 The Lancaster District Labour Party and a resident proposed that the boundary between the three-member Bare and two-member Poulton wards be amended. The Labour Party argued that it should move east to Seaborn Road, while the resident argued it should revert to its existing boundary east of Thornton Road. Neither of these proposals would result in satisfactory electoral equality and little evidence of community ties was received to justify the proposals.

39 The Town Council stated that the proposed boundary between Bare and Torrisholme wards was 'illogical and ill defined', but did not propose alternative boundaries in this area. It also argued that Poulton would lose 'good quality residential development', leading to perceptions of disadvantage. This argument falls outside of our remit and no alternative boundaries were proposed.

40 Other than the general objections discussed above, we did not receive alternative proposals for the proposed Bare and Poulton wards. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. These wards would have 4% more and 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

41 Similarly, no other specific objections or alternative boundary proposals were received with respect to the proposed two-member Torrisholme and three-member Westgate wards. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations

for these wards as final. These wards would have 3% more and 6% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

42 The Lancaster District Labour Party proposed amendments to the boundaries of Harbour, Heysham North and Heysham Central wards. They argued that Harbour should become a three-member ward and that its boundary with Heysham North should move south-west to include those residential areas which would consider themselves to be part of Morecambe and not Heysham.

43 To provide for improved electoral equality, the District Labour Party also proposed that the boundary between Heysham North and Heysham Central should move south to Furness Road and Woodlands Drive. As a consequence, Heysham Central would become a two-member ward.

44 We considered that these proposed boundaries provided for a stronger reflection of communities, particularly with regard to Harbour ward which had excluded some areas which appear to relate more closely to Morecambe than to Heysham. The proposed boundaries also provide for improved electoral equality, notably by significantly reducing the electoral variance of Harbour ward.

45 We were minded to revise our draft recommendations, accepting the amendments to the boundaries of Harbour, Heysham North and Heysham Central wards as proposed by the Lancaster District Labour Party. The three-member Harbour, two-member Heysham North and two-member Heysham Central wards would have -1% fewer, 3% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

46 However, owing to the significance of the proposed changes in this area, we decided to conduct a period of further limited consultation, inviting comment as to whether the revised proposals for Harbour, Heysham North and Heysham Central represented a better reflection of our statutory criteria than our draft recommendations.

47 We received two submissions during our further limited consultation concerning the revised proposals for Morecambe and Heysham. One was from Morecambe Town Council, who stated that they had no further comment to add to their submission made during the draft recommendations consultation. The second was from Councillor Knight of Heysham Central, who stated that he supported the revised proposals in Heysham, and considered that they reflected communities in the area.

48 We have therefore decided to confirm our revised proposals for the three-member Harbour and two-member Heysham North and Heysham Central wards as part of our final recommendations. These wards are forecast to have 1% fewer, 3% more and 3% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

49 Our revised proposals in this area also require revised parish warding arrangements for Morecambe Town Council. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section below.

50 Lancaster District Labour Party also made proposals for amendments to the boundaries of Heysham South and Overton wards. They proposed that the unparished area south of Heysham be included in the Heysham South ward on the

basis that this residential area had little in common with the villages of Overton and Middleton and that such a change would provide for a clearer reflection of communities.

51 To balance electoral equality, the District Labour Party also proposed that the Grosvenor Park Estate north of the White Lund Trading Estate be included in Overton ward. This was justified on the basis that the majority of this residential estate lies within Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish and that it would therefore be more appropriate to include it with other parts of this parish in the proposed Overton ward.

52 We are not persuaded that this proposal would provide for a better reflection of our statutory criteria, as it would result in Overton ward having a variance of 14% and it is not apparent that community ties between the Grosvenor Park Estate and the remainder of this ward are strong enough to justify such an electoral variance.

53 We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for the three-member Heysham South and single-member Overton wards as final. These wards would have equal to and 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

## Rural north Lancaster

54 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 north of the main towns.

55 Our draft recommendations were for a pattern of four single-member, two two-member and one three-member wards. The proposed boundaries were largely based on existing wards with some amendments to reflect the statutory criteria.

56 During consultation on our draft recommendations, seven objections were received to our proposed three-member Carnforth & Warton ward, including from Lancaster City Council, Carnforth Town Council and Warton Parish Council.

57 The objectors stated that a three-member ward would not reflect community ties in this area and in particular that the village of Warton had little in common with the town of Carnforth. Carnforth Town Council also reiterated their view that it was inappropriate to include part of Carnforth in the proposed Bolton-le-Sands ward, noting that there is open countryside between the Crag Bank area and the town of Bolton-le-Sands. They proposed instead that there should be a two-member Carnforth ward covering the parish of the same name.

58 Lancaster City Council did not propose a specific alternative boundary in this area but stated that we should seek to retain a single-member ward covering the parish of Warton, with electoral equality in Carnforth being improved by amending the boundary between this ward and Bolton-le-Sands ward.

59 We were persuaded by the evidence received that it would not be appropriate with regard to community ties to combine the parishes of Carnforth and Warton in a three-member ward. Owing to the lack of specific alternative proposals in this area, we developed revised proposals for warding arrangements which we considered may better reflect the statutory criteria.

60 We accept the evidence provided by Carnforth Town Council indicating that uniting Carnforth town in a single ward would provide for a better reflection of communities. However, the parish alone has too many electors for a two-member ward and too few electors to form a three-member ward on its own.

61 We note that the parish of Warton is currently warded, with the settlement of Millhead immediately to the north of the Carnforth railway line forming a separate parish ward to the larger settlement of Warton. This settlement is similar in character to Carnforth town, and is separated from Warton village by open fields.

62 If the parish ward of Millhead is included in a ward with Carnforth town, this would result in a three-member ward which we consider may provide for a stronger reflection of community identity than our draft recommendations.

63 This amendment would include around 400 electors from Warton parish in the proposed Carnforth & Millhead ward. This would mean the remainder of Warton parish would be too small to form a single-member ward on its own. We therefore propose that the parish of Yealand Conyers, which was included in Silverdale ward in our draft recommendations, instead be included in Warton ward to provide for improved electoral equality. Under these revised proposals, Silverdale ward would therefore comprise the parishes of Silverdale and Yealand Redmayne.

64 As our revised proposals do not include the Crag Bank area of Carnforth in the Bolton-le-Sands ward, further amendments are required to this ward to provide for satisfactory electoral equality. Noting the connection between this area and the neighbouring town of Slyne-with-Hest, we propose that the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest be combined in a new three-member Bolton & Slyne ward.

65 As well as providing for good electoral equality, this proposal would ensure that the whole of Bolton-le-Sands is contained within a single ward, moving away from the proposal in the draft recommendations that the town be divided between two district wards.

66 Given the significance of the proposed changes in this area, we conducted further limited consultation, inviting comment as to whether our revised proposals represented a better reflection of our statutory criteria than our draft recommendations.

67 During the further limited consultation, we received five submissions concerning our revised proposals in this area.

68 Three submissions opposed our proposal for a three-member Bolton & Slyne ward. Councillor Mace of Kellet ward and Councillor Thomas of Slyne-with-Hest stated that the two villages were separate communities and that the proposal for a three-member ward was 'inappropriate for a large rural area'.

69 Slyne-with-Hest Parish Council echoed these views, stating that the proposal did not respect community or history and that representation on Lancaster City Council should reflect the 'distinct characteristics and identities' of the villages. The parish council also objected to the proposed name of Bolton & Slyne, stating that the separate settlement of Hest Bank should also be acknowledged in the ward name.

70 We do not find the evidence submitted against our revised proposal for a Bolton & Slyne ward to be persuasive. In particular, we note that the submissions argue Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest are distinct communities. Our draft recommendations did not reflect this, as part of the village of Bolton-le-Sands was proposed to be included in the Slyne-with-Hest ward, dividing the community of Bolton-le-Sands.

71 By contrast, the revised proposal for a three-member ward means that Bolton-le-Sands parish is no longer divided between wards, better reflecting the community identity of the village. We consider that it is preferable with regard to community identity to combine distinct communities in a single ward than to divide a community between wards.

72 We have therefore adopted our revised proposal for a three-member ward comprising the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest as part of our final recommendations.

73 We note the evidence of Slyne-with-Hest Parish Council concerning the inclusion of Hest Bank in the ward name. However, it is not necessary to include the names of all settlements in a ward name. We therefore confirm the name of Bolton & Slyne as final. The three-member Bolton & Slyne ward is forecast to have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

74 We received two submissions concerning our revised proposal for a three-member Carnforth & Millhead ward. Carnforth Town Council supported the proposal, though did not provide evidence. Warton Parish Council opposed the revised proposal, stating that the settlements of Warton and Millhead lay in close proximity to each other and that dividing them between wards would make representation impractical for parish councillors.

75 We are not persuaded by the evidence submitted by Warton Parish Council. We note that, while Millhead and Warton lie in close proximity, they are clearly distinct settlements, and that Millhead also lies in close proximity to Carnforth with a strong road connection.

76 We consider that our revised proposal in this area provides for satisfactory electoral equality while avoiding the division of contiguous residential settlements. We have therefore adopted our revised proposals for a three-member Carnforth & Millhead ward, a single-member Warton ward and a single-member Silverdale ward as part of our final recommendations. These wards are forecast to have 11% fewer, 10% fewer and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

77 Our final recommendations in this area require consequential parish warding arrangements for Warton parish. These are discussed in the parish electoral arrangements section below.

78 During consultation on our draft recommendations, we received four submissions from parish councils regarding our proposal to include the parish of Gressingham in the single-member Kellet ward. Councillor Mace of Kellet ward supported the proposal, as did the parishes of Nether Kellet and Over Kellet.

79 Gressingham Parish Council objected to the proposal on the grounds that it had stronger community ties with the Upper Lune Valley ward, particularly with the parish of Hornby with which it has ecclesiastical and educational ties. It argued that the remaining villages in Kellet ward had stronger connections to their south-west in the direction of Halton, Carnforth and Lancaster, and little relationship with villages such as Gressingham to their east.

80 We are persuaded by the evidence of community ties with Upper Lune Valley ward presented by Gressingham Parish Council. We have therefore amended our proposals in this area so that the parish of Gressingham is included in the proposed Upper Lune Valley ward. The revised single-member Kellet and single-member Upper Lune Valley wards are forecast to have 5% fewer and 9% more electors per councillor than the district average in 2018, respectively.

81 We did not receive any submissions regarding our proposed single-member Halton-with-Aughton ward. We therefore confirm this ward as part of our final recommendations. Halton-with-Aughton ward is forecast to have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

### Lancaster city and rural south Lancaster

82 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 of Lancaster and four rural parishes, with five further rural parishes lying to its east.

83 Our draft recommendations were for a pattern of five two-member and six three-member wards. The proposed wards were largely based on existing boundaries with amendments to better reflect the statutory criteria.

84 Three submissions were received in relation to our proposed University & Scotforth Rural ward. A resident and Lancaster & Morecambe Liberal Democrats expressed concern that the parish of Scotforth had been included in this ward, considering that it had little community connection with the university campus.

85 The resident argued that the parish of Scotforth should be divided between wards, with the detached area of the parish to the west of the University being included in Ellel ward. Lancaster & Morecambe Liberal Democrats considered that the larger part of the parish to the east of the University should be included in Lower Lune Valley ward.

86 The University & Scotforth Rural ward as proposed in our draft recommendations is forecast to have 11% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018. Any transfer of electors from this ward would result in a further deterioration of electoral equality. We do not consider that the community evidence with respect to Scotforth parish is strong enough to counterbalance the electoral variance which would result. We therefore confirm the three-member University & Scotforth Rural ward unchanged as part of our final recommendations.

87 Ellel Parish Council objected to the creation of new parish wards in Ellel parish to reflect the new boundary of the University & Scotforth Rural ward. In particular, it argued that the reduction of councillors for the North and South parish wards, and



increase in councillors for the University parish wards, would 'alter the commitment given to rural and village locations'. However, the allocation of councillors to parish wards in Ellel parish reflects the electorates of those parish wards. We therefore confirm our recommendations for parish electoral arrangements in Ellel parish as final. These are outlined in detail in the parish electoral arrangements section below.

88 We did not receive any other submissions regarding the proposed two-member Ellel and two-member Lower Lune Valley wards. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. Ellel ward and Lower Lune Valley ward would have 5% fewer and 1% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

89 In the urban area of Lancaster City, Morecambe Town Council objected to the inclusion of the Grosvenor Park Estate in the proposed Skerton West ward on the basis that 'these areas have regarded themselves as part of Morecambe for many decades'. The Town Council also made arguments regarding levels of economic deprivation in Skerton West ward and the potential effects on property prices and insurance premiums. Other than the Lancaster District Labour Party's scheme discussed in the Morecambe and Heysham section above, no other submissions were received making specific reference to our proposals in this area.

90 The parish boundary between Morecambe and Heaton-with-Oxcliffe runs through the middle of the Grosvenor Park Estate. Access to this estate is also from the east, in the direction of Lancaster, and not west in the direction of Morecambe.

91 We are therefore not persuaded that including this area in a Morecambe ward provides for a stronger reflection of community identity. We therefore confirm as final our proposal to include the Grosvenor Park Estate in Skerton West ward. The three-member Skerton West ward is forecast to have 2% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

92 No alternative proposals were received for our two-member Scotforth East and three-member Bulk, John O'Gaunt, Scotforth West and Skerton East wards. We have therefore decided to confirm our draft recommendations for these wards as final. Bulk, John O'Gaunt, Scotforth East, Scotforth West and Skerton East are forecast to have 3% fewer, 4% more, 5% more, equal to and 7% fewer electors per councillor than the district average by 2018, respectively.

93 A local district councillor and local resident both proposed that the proposed two-member Duke's ward be renamed Castle on the grounds that it now included Lancaster Castle within its boundaries, that Castle was a historic name and that the provenance of Duke's was unclear. The local resident also suggested 'Castle & Duke's' as a possible alternative ward name.

94 We are persuaded by these arguments and so have renamed the two-member Duke's ward as Castle as part of our final recommendations. No objections were received to the proposed boundaries of this ward and so we have decided, subject to the ward name change, to confirm our draft recommendations as final. The two-member Castle ward is forecast to have 6% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

95 No objections were received to our proposed two-member Marsh ward other than from a local resident who proposed three alternative ward names. No evidence was provided for these names. We have therefore decided to confirm the proposed

Marsh ward as part of our final recommendations. This ward is forecast to have 4% more electors per councillor than the district average by 2018.

## Conclusions

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

**Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements**

	Final recommendations	
	2012	2018
Number of councillors	60	60
Number of electoral wards/divisions	27	27
Average number of electors per councillor	1,816	1,827
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	3	2
Number of wards/divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

**Final recommendation**

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

## Parish electoral arrangements

97 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.

98 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.

99 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Ellel.

**Final recommendation**

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). Proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

100 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe.

**Final recommendation**

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). Proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

101 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Morecambe.

**Final recommendation**

Morecambe Town Council should return 26 town councillors, as at present, representing 11 wards: Bare North (returning three members), Bare South East (returning one member), Bare South West (returning one member), Harbour (returning five members), 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). Proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

102 To meet our obligations under the 2009 Act, we propose consequential parish warding arrangements for the parish of Warton.

**Final recommendation**

Warton Parish Council should return eight parish councillors, as at present, representing two wards: Millhead (returning two members) and Warton (returning six members). Proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

### 3 What happens next?

102 We have now completed our review of electoral arrangements for Lancaster City Council. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. The draft Order will provide for new electoral arrangements which will come into force at the next elections for Lancaster in 2015.

#### Equalities

103 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.

## 4 Mapping

### Final recommendations for Lancaster

104 The following maps illustrate our proposed ward boundaries for Lancaster City Council:

- **Sheet 1, Map 1** illustrates in outline form the proposed wards for Lancaster City Council.

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

## Appendix A

**Table A1: Final 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 & Slyne	3	6,058	2,019	11%	5,713	1,904	4%
3	Bulk	3	5,125	1,708	-6%	5,293	1,764	-3%
4	Carnforth & Millhead	3	4,879	1,626	-10%	4,895	1,632	-11%
5	Castle	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	3	5,724	1,908	5%	5,432	1,811	-1%
9	Heysham Central	2	3,662	1,831	1%	3,767	1,884	3%
10	Heysham North	2	3,622	1,811	0%	3,772	1,886	3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final 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>
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	1,751	1,751	-4%	1,729	1,729	-5%
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	1,598	1,598	-12%	1,700	1,700	-7%
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	Torrisholme	2	3,825	1,913	5%	3,751	1,876	3%

**Table A1 (cont.): Final 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>
24	University & Scotforth Rural	3	4,859	1,620	-11%	4,859	1,620	-11%
25	Upper Lune Valley	1	1,989	1,989	10%	1,995	1,995	9%
26	Warton	1	1,709	1,709	-6%	1,637	1,637	-10%
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 the Lancaster City Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each 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 or division, expressed in parishes or existing wards or divisions, 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. The Local Government Boundary Commission for England assumed the functions of the Boundary Committee for England in April 2010
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

