

Final recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancashire County Council

Electoral review

April 2016

Translations and other formats

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

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

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

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2016

Contents

Summary	1
1 Introduction	2
2 Analysis and final recommendations	4
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Council size	5
Division patterns	6
Draft recommendations	6
Final recommendations	6
Detailed divisions	10
Burnley Borough	11
Chorley Borough	12
Fylde Borough	13
Hyndburn Borough	15
Lancaster City	16
Pendle Borough	18
Preston City	20
Ribble Valley Borough	22
Rossendale Borough	23
South Ribble Borough	25
West Lancashire Borough	27
Wyre Borough	29
Conclusions	32
Parish electoral arrangements	32
3 What happens next?	35
Appendices	
A Table A1: Final recommendations for Lancashire County Council	36
B Submissions received	44
C Glossary and abbreviations	47

Summary

Who we are

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

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

Electoral review

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

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

Why Lancashire?

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

Our proposals for Lancashire

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

Electoral arrangements

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

We have finalised our recommendations for electoral arrangements in Lancashire.

1 Introduction

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

What is an electoral review?

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

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

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

Consultation

4 We wrote to the Council inviting the submission of proposals on council size. We then held two periods of consultation: firstly on division patterns for the Council and secondly on our draft recommendations. The submissions received during our consultations have informed our final recommendations.

5 This review is being conducted as follows:

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

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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:

Professor Colin Mellors (Chair)

Alison Lowton

Peter Maddison QPM

Sir Tony Redmond

Professor Paul Wiles CB

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and final recommendations

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

9 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Submissions received

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

Electorate figures

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

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

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

Council size

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

19 A council size of 84 provides the following allocation between the borough/city councils in the county. In brackets, we have also listed the percentage of city and borough wards that are wholly contained within our proposed divisions. We refer to this as coterminosity:

- Burnley Borough – six councillors (73%)
- Chorley Borough – eight councillors (90%)
- Fylde Borough – six councillors (95%)
- Hyndburn Borough – six councillors (63%)
- Lancaster City – 10 councillors (74%)
- Pendle Borough – six councillors (70%)
- Preston City – nine councillors (64%)
- Ribble Valley Borough – four councillors (79%)
- Rossendale Borough – five councillors (86%)

- South Ribble Borough – eight councillors (74%)
- West Lancashire Borough – eight councillors (84%)
- Wyre Borough – eight councillors (75%)

Division patterns

20 During consultation on division patterns, we received 66 submissions including county-wide proposals from Lancashire County Council and the Conservative Group on Lancashire County Council. We also received submissions from Chorley Borough Council, Hyndburn Borough Council, Lancaster City Council, Ribble Valley Borough Council, Rossendale Borough Council, South Ribble Borough Council, West Lancashire Borough Council and Wyre Borough Council in relation to divisions within their authority areas. The remainder of submissions received were from political groups, parish and town councils, councillors, local organisations and local residents from across the county. These respondents provided localised comments for division arrangements in specific areas of Lancashire.

Draft recommendations

21 We received 145 submissions during consultation on our draft recommendations. These are detailed in Appendix B. We received localised and county-wide comments relating to 11 of the 12 borough/city areas of the county. The majority of submissions concentrated on our proposals for Pendle Rural, Pendle Hill and Brierfield & Nelson West in Pendle Borough; Fylde East and Fylde South divisions in Fylde Borough; and Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors division in Hyndburn Borough.

Final recommendations

Burnley Borough

22 We received no submissions relating to Burnley Borough. We are confirming our draft recommendations as final in this borough.

Chorley Borough

23 We received 11 submissions relating to Chorley Borough. Chorley Borough Council supported the draft recommendations, as did Anderton Parish Council. Chorley Conservatives, along with a county councillor, proposed a different pattern of divisions for the borough. Two parish councils and a borough councillor objected to the inclusion of part of Clayton with the rural parishes in our proposed Hoghton with Wheelton division. They argued that this would not reflect community identities in the area. One of the parishes stated that it would prefer to retain the existing division boundaries here. A parish councillor suggested amending the name of our proposed Euxton with Buckshaw division to include Astley, arguing that it would better reflect the communities in the division. We consider that this is a logical change, and so we are amending this division's name to Euxton, Buckshaw & Astley.

24 We also received submissions from two parishes in the south of the borough, which favoured including all of Coppull parish in the same division. Our draft recommendations adhered to the existing ward boundary here, and split the parish between two divisions. We are amending the boundary, so that Coppull parish is entirely located in Chorley South division.

25 We do not consider that we have received persuasive evidence to change any other boundaries in this borough. We therefore confirm the remainder of our draft recommendations in Chorley Borough as final.

Fylde Borough

26 We received five submissions relating to this borough, all of which were from parish or town councils. Four of these submissions opposed our decision to split Newton-with-Clifton between Fylde East and Fylde South divisions. We received evidence showing that the whole parish has a strong sense of community identity. The parish has shared community groups and activities, and we were persuaded to amend our division arrangements here. All of Newton-with-Clifton parish will be in Fylde East division. This means that Fylde South will contain 11% fewer electors than the average for the county by 2021. This is a higher variance than we would usually recommend; however, we consider that the evidence of community identity is strong enough for us to move away from our draft recommendations here.

27 While we have received objections to our draft recommendations in other areas of the borough, we did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received to justify amending our draft recommendations. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for the remaining divisions in Fylde Borough as final.

Hyndburn Borough

28 We received 11 submissions in relation to Hyndburn Borough. Eight of the submissions, including that of Hyndburn Borough Council, supported all or part of our draft proposals. Three submissions opposed our proposed two-member Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors division. A borough councillor argued in favour of splitting the proposed division into two single-member divisions. We considered that this would divide Great Harwood unnecessarily between divisions, whereas our proposed two-member division unites rather than divides communities.

29 We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations for divisions in Hyndburn Borough as final.

Lancaster City

30 We received three submissions relating to Lancaster City. Our draft recommendations were supported by a parish council. Two other respondents proposed changes to the division boundary between Lancaster Central and Lancaster South East divisions. However, the evidence received was not persuasive and we consider our proposed divisions better reflect the statutory criteria. We therefore confirm our draft recommendations for divisions in Lancaster City as final.

Pendle Borough

31 We received over 75 individual submissions relating to Pendle Borough, including one from Andrew Stephenson MP (Pendle), as well as nearly 300 pro-forma letters favouring a boundary amendment between two divisions – Pendle Hill and Brierfield & Nelson West. We also received over 350 pro-forma letters in support of our proposed Pendle Rural division.

32 A large number of submissions, including one from Lancashire County Council, objected to our proposed two-member Pendle Rural division. Opponents of the division argued that Barnoldswick should not be in a division with so many rural

parishes, and many of them favoured the County Council's proposal. In addition to the pro-forma letters relating to this area we did receive some individual submissions supporting our proposed two-member division. We do not consider that the County Council's proposal to include Barnoldswick and Earby, along with further rural parishes to the west of the area, in a single-member division would provide the best reflection of community identities in the area. Therefore, we are confirming as final our proposed two-member Pendle Rural division.

33 We received several hundred pro-forma letters arguing in favour of amendments to the boundary between our proposed Pendle Hill and Brierfield & Nelson West divisions. The letters provided good evidence in favour of the change, arguing that there are few links between Nelson and the remainder of Pendle Hill division, and that Brierfield should be kept in the same division. We consider that this amendment would meet our statutory criteria, and we are therefore amending our draft recommendations here.

Preston City

34 We received two submissions related exclusively to Preston City, and the city was also mentioned in three other submissions which discussed more than one area of the county. One of these submissions argued that divisions should be coterminous where possible, and one supported our proposed division boundaries and names.

35 The County Council suggested amending the boundary between Preston East and Preston South East divisions. We were not persuaded that sufficient evidence was provided for this proposed amendment, and we do not consider that it would better meet our statutory criteria. We are not proposing to change any of the divisions in Preston, and we confirm our draft recommendations as final here.

Ribble Valley

36 We received seven submissions relating to this authority. One submission supported our proposals, while four submissions argued that the authority should be allocated an additional county councillor, increasing its representation from four to five. We considered whether an additional councillor was necessary during the formulation of our draft recommendations, and we determined that the electorate projections put forward by Ribble Valley Borough Council were not likely to be fulfilled, and that an additional county councillor was not justified.

37 Ribble Valley Borough Council also noted that our proposals split two parishes, Aighton, Bailey & Chaigley and Grindleton. The Council argued that this would not reflect community identities or provide for effective and convenient local government. We are amending our proposed boundaries here so that these parishes are contained within single divisions – Ribble Valley North East and Ribble Valley South West respectively. Aside from this change, we are confirming our draft recommendations as final for the borough.

Rossendale Borough

38 We received two submissions relating to Rossendale Borough, one from Rossendale Borough Council and the other from Rossendale & Darwen Conservative Association. The Borough Council favoured retaining the existing division arrangements, but also put forward two alternative proposals for divisions in the borough. The Conservative Association suggested two amendments between our proposed Rossendale South and Rossendale West divisions.

39 We are proposing three amendments to our proposed division boundaries, as well as changing the names of two of our proposed divisions. One of the changes means that Edenfield is wholly contained in the same division, Rossendale South, rather than being split between Rossendale South and Rossendale West. The other change is in the Haslingden area. We consider that the amended boundary, following Manchester Road, is stronger and more recognisable than the one we had put forward in our draft recommendations.

40 We are also amending part of the boundary between our proposed Rossendale South and Rossendale North divisions. This amendment avoids unnecessarily splitting communities in this area. We are also changing the name of our proposed division from Rossendale North to Mid-Rossendale.

41 The other division name we are amending here is Whitworth division, which we are now proposing be named Whitworth & Bacup. We consider that this change better reflects the communities in this area. Aside from these amendments, we are confirming as final our draft recommendations in the borough.

South Ribble Borough

42 We received six submissions directly relating to South Ribble Borough, as well as two other submissions which mentioned the borough as well as other areas of the county. South Ribble Borough Council supported the draft recommendations. We had based our proposals on the Council's cross-party submission that was received during the consultation on division patterns.

43 We received a submission from the Conservative Group on the County Council, opposing several of our proposed divisions, highlighting a lack of community identity. We also received a submission from a county councillor expressing similar views. Two parish councils put forward similar views to those expressed in the Conservative Group's submission.

44 We consider that our draft recommendations will ensure effective and convenient local government as they are largely coterminous with the recently implemented borough ward boundaries. We are satisfied that our proposed divisions meet the statutory criteria, and we therefore confirm them as final.

West Lancashire Borough

45 We received six submissions directly related to this borough, as well as two others which mentioned the borough as well as other areas of the county. West Lancashire Borough Council commented only on the parish warding arrangements of Aughton parish. The parish council itself also commented on our proposals, which amended its warding arrangements. We are now proposing to leave the parish wards unchanged, as there is no obligation on us to amend them as part of this review.

46 Two other submissions opposed the split between West Lancashire East and Ormskirk divisions, arguing that the split did not reflect community identities in this area. Under the existing arrangements, Ormskirk town is split between two divisions, and given our obligation to provide divisions with good electoral equality, we consider that our proposals represent the best way to meet the statutory criteria. We do not consider that we received persuasive evidence to change our division boundaries in this borough, and we are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final.

Wyre Borough

47 We received nine submissions in relation to this borough, including some support for our proposed divisions. Two parish councils and a local organisation opposed our proposed Thornton & Hambleton division, stating that the more rural parishes in this division would have their views subordinate to the larger population in the urban area of Thornton. Given the electoral imbalances in this area under the existing division arrangements, we have no alternative but to amend division boundaries here.

48 Wyre Borough Council echoed the views of those respondents regarding the Thornton & Hambleton division. The Council also suggested some amendments between our proposed Wyre Rural Central and Wye Rural East divisions. We are adopting two of these changes as part of our final recommendations. We are including Nateby parish in Wyre Rural East division. This will avoid splitting Garstang town between divisions, and reflects the recently implemented borough ward boundaries. The Borough Council suggested moving Cabus parish to Wyre Rural Central division. However, we consider that this would result in a split of Garstang, so we are not adopting this proposed amendment. We are also including Myerscough & Bilsborrow parish in Wyre Rural East division. Myerscough & Bilsborrow Parish Council sent in a submission favouring this arrangement, and we consider that it reflects community identities in the area.

49 Elsewhere in Wyre Borough, we have confirmed our draft recommendations as final.

Detailed divisions

50 The tables on pages 11–31 detail our final recommendations for each area of Lancashire. They detail how the proposed divisions how the proposed division arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

Burnley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burnley Central East	1	0%	This division comprises the community of Brunshaw as well as the eastern part of the town centre.	We did not receive any submissions regarding this borough. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final for all the divisions in the borough.
Burnley Central West	1	-3%	This division contains the western part of the town centre, and the parish of Ightenhill.	
Burnley North East	1	-6%	This division comprises the area to the north-east of the town centre.	
Burnley Rural	1	2%	This division comprises the parishes of Briercliffe, Cliviger and Worsthorne-with-Hurstwood, and lies to the east of the town.	
Burnley South West	1	2%	This division comprises the area to the south-west of the town centre and is divided by the M65.	
Padiham & Burnley West	1	-5%	This division comprises the parishes of Dunnockshaw, Habergham Eaves, Hapton and Padiham, and lies to the south and west of the town.	

Chorley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Chorley Central	1	-2%	This division covers the central area of Chorley town.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these two divisions, and so we are confirming our draft recommendations as final here.
Chorley North	1	-8%	This division comprises an area to the north and east of Chorley town, and contains a stretch of the M6.	
Chorley Rural East	1	-10%	This division lies to the east of Chorley town and comprises the parishes of Adlington, Anderton, Anglezarke, Heapey, Heath Charnock and Rivington, and part of the parish of Whittle-le-Woods.	We received a submission from a parish council which supported this division. We are confirming this division as part of our final recommendations.
Chorley Rural West	1	-3%	This division lies to the west of Chorley town and comprises the parishes of Bretherton, Charnock Richard, Croston, Eccleston, Heskin, Mawdesley and Ulnes Walton.	We received two submissions specifically related to these two divisions. Two parish councils argued that Coppull parish should not be split between two divisions. We consider that including the whole parish in one division, Chorley South, reflects community identities, and so we are amending our draft recommendations here.
Chorley South	1	7%	This division comprises the area to the south of Chorley town centre and contains Coppull parish.	
Clayton with Whittle	1	-2%	This division is to the north of Chorley town, and	We received three submissions in relation to this division, which also referenced neighbouring Hoghton with Wheelton

			contains the parish of Cuerden as well as parts of the parishes of Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods.	division. Respondents argued that including part of the urban area of Clayton in a division with rural parishes (as we have in Hoghton with Wheelton division) does not reflect community identities. Given the need to provide for good electoral equality, we have proposed divisions which are different from the existing arrangements which have high electoral variances. We believe that our proposals represent the best balance of the statutory criteria, and so we are confirming this division as final.
Euxton, Buckshaw & Astley	1	6%	This division comprises the Buckshaw village area, and the parishes of Astley village and Euxton.	We received a submission from a parish councillor suggesting that our proposed division name of Euxton with Buckshaw be amended to reflect the fact that the community of Astley is a part of the division. We have amended the division name to include Astley within it, and we confirm the division's boundaries as final.
Hoghton with Wheelton	1	-8%	This division comprises the parishes of Brindle, Hoghton, Wheelton and Withnell, as well as part of the parish of Clayton-le-Woods.	As mentioned above, we received some submissions which argued that rural parishes such as those in this division should not be in a division with the more urban Clayton area. However, in order to provide for good electoral equality here and across the borough, we have split Clayton between two divisions. We are confirming our draft recommendations here as final.

Fylde Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Fylde East	1	10%	This division comprises the parishes of Kirkham, Medlar-with-Wesham, Newton-with-Clifton and Treales, Roseacre & Wharles.	We received five submissions relating to this part of the borough. Four of the submissions were from parish councils which opposed our proposal to split Newton-with-Clifton parish between two divisions. We consider that these submissions contained strong evidence of the shared community links across the parish. We have therefore decided to amend our

Fylde South	1	-11%	This division comprises Bryning-with-Warton, Freckleton and Ribby-with-Wrea parishes.	<p>proposed division boundary and include all of Newton-with-Clifton parish in Fylde East division.</p> <p>This change will result in Fylde South having an electoral variance of -11%, which is a higher variance from the average than we would normally propose. In this case, however, we consider that the evidence received regarding community identities and interests is strong enough to warrant changing our draft recommendations.</p>
Fylde West	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Elswick, Greenhalgh-with-Thistleton, Little Eccleston-with-Larbreck, Singleton, Staining, Weeton-with-Preese, Westby-with-Plumpton and part of Lytham St Annes.	We did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them all as part of our final recommendations.
Lytham	1	-1%	This division comprises most of the community of Lytham.	
St Annes North	1	2%	This division comprises the northern part of St Annes, and contains Blackpool Airport.	
St Annes South	1	7%	This division comprises the southern part of St Annes.	

Hyndburn Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Accrington North	1	-7%	This division covers the northern part of Accrington town, and the Huncoat area to the north-east of the town.	We received two submissions which specifically supported these two divisions, as well as two which expressed support for all of the divisions in the borough. We are therefore confirming these divisions as part of our final recommendations.
Accrington South	1	-8%	This division covers the south of Accrington town, and the centre of Accrington.	
Accrington West & Oswaldtwistle Central	1	-7%	This division covers an area to the west of Accrington town centre, and the centre of Oswaldtwistle.	We received one submission directly relating to this division, which expressed support for it. We are therefore confirming this division as part of our final recommendations.
Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors	2	-8%	This two-member division contains Altham parish, as well as the communities of Great Harwood and Clayton-le-Moors.	<p>We received seven submissions directly relating to this division. Four of these submissions supported our proposals.</p> <p>Three submissions expressed opposition to this two-member division, arguing that it would be too large and may be difficult for residents to relate to it and for them to be properly represented. Two respondents proposed two single-member divisions instead of our proposed two-member division. We consider that our proposed two-member division unites communities in this part of the borough, and that a pattern of two single-member divisions would divide communities in order to achieve good electoral equality. Therefore, we are confirming as final our proposed division.</p>
Oswaldtwistle	1	-9%	This division comprises most of the community of Oswaldtwistle including Broadfield, as well as a	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to this division, and we received two submissions expressing support for every division in the borough.

			large rural area in the south-west of the borough.	We are content, therefore, to adopt this division as part of our final recommendations.
--	--	--	--	---

Lancaster City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Heysham	1	1%	This division comprises the community of Heysham, and the parishes of Overton and Middleton, as well as part of the parish of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe.	We did not receive any submissions relating to this division, and we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.
Lancaster Central	1	-9%	This division covers the centre of Lancaster city, and contains the parishes of Cockerham and Thurnham.	<p>We received two submissions relating to this division, both proposing to amend its boundary with Lancaster South East in two places. One of the proposals would include the largely rural area in the south of our proposed Lancaster Central division in Lancaster South East. We consider that this amendment would not reflect community links, and that our proposed Lancaster Central division has strong road links across it.</p> <p>The other proposed amendment between these divisions would result in Lancaster South East having 12% fewer electors than the county average by 2021. While we have accepted electoral variances of greater than 10% elsewhere in the county – including one with 13% – we do not consider that there is strong evidence to support doing so here. Therefore, we are confirming our proposed division as final.</p>
Lancaster East	1	-4%	This division comprises the north-eastern part of Lancaster city.	We did not receive any submissions relating to this division, and we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.

Lancaster Rural East	1	-7%	This division covers the large rural area to the east and north-east of the city, and comprises the parishes of Burrow-with-Burrow, Cantsfield, Caton-with-Littledale, Claughton, Gressingham, Ellel, Halton-with-Aughton, Hornby-with-Farleton, Ireby, Leck, Melling-with-Wrayton, Over Wyresdale, Quernmore, Roeburndale, Tatham, Tunstall, Wennington, Whittington and Wray-with-Botton.	We received one submission regarding this division, from a parish council which supported our proposals. We are adopting this division as part of our final recommendations.
Lancaster Rural North	1	-10%	This division covers the large rural area to the north and north-west of the city, and comprises the parishes of Arkholme-with-Cawood, Borwick, Carnforth, Nether Kellet, Priest Hutton, Over Kellet, Silverdale, Warton, Yealand Conyers and Yealand Redmayne.	We did not receive any submissions relating to this division, and we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.
Lancaster South East	1	-2%	This division comprises the communities of Bowerham and Newlands, and the parish of Scotforth.	As mentioned above, we received two submissions proposing to amend this division's boundaries with Lancaster Central. However, we are not persuaded that there is a strong case to make these amendments, and we are confirming our proposed division here as final.

Morecambe Central	1	4%	This division comprises the central area of Morecambe town.	We did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them all as part of our final recommendations.
Morecambe North	1	-5%	This division comprises the northern part of Morecambe town as well as the parishes of Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest.	
Morecambe South	1	2%	This division comprises the south of Morecambe town and part of Heaton-with-Oxcliffe parish.	
Skerton	1	-6%	This division comprises the community of Skerton, to the north-west of Lancaster city.	

Pendle Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Brierfield & Nelson West	1	5%	This division comprises parts of the parishes of Brierfield and Nelson.	<p>We received nearly 300 pro-forma letters as well as several other submissions regarding this division, and its boundary with Pendle Hill. The submissions all suggested a boundary amendment between the divisions which, they argued, would better reflect community identities in this area. We also received two other submissions which proposed a different arrangement from our proposals.</p> <p>We consider that the pro-forma letters contained strong evidence to amend the boundary between this division and Pendle Hill, and that the amended boundaries will result in</p>

				acceptable electoral equality. Therefore, we are amending our draft recommendations here.
Nelson East	1	10%	This division comprises the majority of Nelson town.	We received only one submission regarding these divisions. It argued for retaining the existing arrangements. Given the need to reduce electoral imbalances in all parts of the borough, we proposed new divisions here in our draft recommendations which we have decided to confirm as final.
Pendle Central	1	3%	This division comprises most of the town of Colne, and part of the parish of Nelson.	
Pendle Hill	1	9%	This division comprises the community of Higherford, as well as the parishes of Barley-with-Wheatley Booth, Barrowford, Goldshaw Booth, Higham-with-West Close Booth, Old Laund Booth, Reedley Hallows and Roughlee Booth, and part of the parish of Brierfield.	As mentioned above, we received a large number of submissions in favour of amending the boundary between this division and Brierfield & Nelson West. We are amending the boundary as part of our final recommendations.
Pendle Rural	2	1%	This two-member division comprises the parishes of Barnoldswick, Blacko, Bracewell & Brogden, Earby, Foulridge, Laneshaw Bridge, Kelbrook & Sough, Salterforth and Trawden Forest, as well as part of the parish of Colne.	<p>We received over 350 pro-forma letters supporting our proposed division, as well as a large number of letters stating opposition to it. Those who supported it argued that the division united the parishes and communities in the West Craven area, which share similar interests and issues. Some submissions also provided evidence of shared community links in the division – a local newspaper and a local school.</p> <p>Those opposing the proposed division tended to favour splitting the division in to two single-member divisions, with one comprising Barnoldswick and Earby, and one comprising the rural parishes to the south of those two communities. While we understand the concerns of those who opposed the two-member division, we consider that having two single-member divisions would divide communities. There is no</p>

				direct road link between Barnoldswick and Earby, and so we consider that this proposed division would not meet our statutory criteria. Therefore, we are confirming our proposed two-member division as final.
--	--	--	--	--

Preston City

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Preston Central East	1	4%	This division comprises the area to the east of Preston city centre, and contains the community of Deepdale.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them all as part of our final recommendations.
Preston Central West	1	0%	This division comprises an area to the west of the city centre.	
Preston City	1	-1%	This division covers the central area of Preston, and is on the southern edge of the authority. It also contains the area around the docks.	
Preston East	1	4%	This division is on the eastern edge of the city, and contains part of the Ribbleton community.	<p>We received two responses regarding the boundary between this division and Preston South East division. One of them opposed our proposal to include two areas off Pope Lane in Preston South East division, arguing that our proposed boundary does not reflect communities.</p> <p>The other submission proposed amending the boundary between this division and Preston South East. This would result in Moor Nook being in Preston East division, and Ribble Village being in Preston South East. A further two areas of Ribbleton would also be included in Preston South</p>

				East. We do not consider that persuasive evidence was provided to make this amendment. Our proposed boundaries largely follow main roads, and are clear and easily identifiable. Therefore, we are adopting this division as part of our final recommendations.
Preston North	1	4%	This division contains the communities of Fulwood and Sharoe Green.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them both as part of our final recommendations.
Preston Rural	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Barton, Broughton, Goosnargh, Grimsargh, Haighton, Whittingham and Woodplumpton to the north and east of the city.	
Preston South East	1	7%	This division is on the south-eastern edge of the authority, and contains part of the Ribbleton community.	As mentioned above, we received some submissions that proposed amending this division's boundary with Preston East. We were not persuaded to make this change, and we are adopting this division as part of our final recommendations.
Preston South West	1	6%	This division contains the community of Ashton-on-Ribble, and is on the south-western edge of the authority.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them both as part of our final recommendations.
Preston West	1	0%	This division contains the parishes of Ingol & Tanterton, and Lea in the rural area to the west of the city.	

Ribble Valley Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Clitheroe	1	13%	This division comprises the town and parish of Clitheroe, and is bounded by the River Ribble on its west and north.	One submission expressed support for our proposed division. We also received some submissions which expressed concern that this division's high variance could get much higher in the future. We consider that the electorate projections we are working with are fair and accurate, and that despite this division having a higher electoral variance than we would normally accept, this division reflects community identities and will provide effective and convenient local government for its residents.
Longridge with Bowland	1	3%	This division is a largely rural one, comprising the parishes of Bashall Eaves, Bowland Forest High, Bowland Forest Low, Bowland-with-Leagram, Chipping, Dutton, Easington, Gisburn Forest, Hothersall, Longridge Newton, Ribchester, Slaidburn, Thornley-with-Wheatley and Waddington. It contains Bowland Forest Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	<p>We received one submission from a parish in this division, and the division was mentioned in several other submissions. The parish argued that it should be in the same division as its neighbouring parishes, as they have shared issues and concerns. These parishes will all be in this division.</p> <p>In our draft proposals we had split Grindleton parish between our proposed Longridge with Bowland and Ribble Valley North East divisions. We received some submissions which opposed this, arguing that the split would not reflect communities or provide for effective and convenient local government. We are amending our proposals here, and have included all of Grindleton parish in Ribble Valley North East division. Similarly, we received some submissions arguing that Aighton, Bailey & Chaigley should not be split between this division and Ribble Valley South West. We are amending our draft recommendations so that the parish is entirely in Ribble Valley South West.</p>
Ribble Valley North East	1	9%	This division comprises the parishes of Bolton-by-	As mentioned above, we received some submissions arguing that Grindleton parish should not be split between

			Bowland, Chatburn, Downham, Gisburn, Grindleton, Horton, Mearley, Middop, Newsholme, Paythorne, Pendleton, Read, Rimington, Sabden, Sawley, Simonstone, Twiston, West Bradford, Whalley, Wiswell and Worston.	this division and Longridge with Bowland. We have amended this division to include all of Grindleton in it.
Ribble Valley South West	1	10%	This division comprises the parishes of Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley, Balderstone, Billington & Langho, Clayton-le-Dale, Dinckley, Great Mitton, Little Mitton, Mellor, Osbaldeston, Ramsgreave, Salesbury and Wilpshire.	As mentioned above, we received some submissions arguing that Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley parish should not be split between this division and Longridge with Bowland. We have amended this division to include all of Aughton, Bailey & Chaigley in it.

Rossendale Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Mid-Rossendale	1	10%	This division comprises Goodshaw, Reedsholme and part of Rawtenstall.	<p>We are amending our proposed Rossendale North division – and re-naming it Mid-Rossendale – based on a borough-wide proposal we received.</p> <p>We are amending part of this division’s boundary with Rossendale South, to avoid splitting the communities to the east of Rawtenstall. While this amendment worsens the electoral equality, it is within the range of electoral variances</p>

				that we usually aim for and better reflects community identities.
Rossendale East	1	-1%	This division covers the east and north-east parts of the borough and contains part of the community of Bacup.	We received a borough-wide proposal which would have amended this division, but we are not persuaded to change our proposed division here. We consider that the division proposed in the borough-wide scheme would divide communities to the south-west of Bacup. We consider that our proposed division has more easily identifiable boundaries, and does not divide communities. We therefore confirm it as final.
Rossendale South	1	-7%	This division comprises Edenfield, parts of Haslingden and Rawtenstall and a rural area in the south of the borough.	We received proposals for changing this division's boundaries with Rossendale West, both as part of borough-wide schemes, and as a specific submission for the area. One of the submissions argued that our proposals would split Edenfield between divisions, and leave part of it in a division with communities with which it has little in common. The borough-wide submission also suggested moving part of Greenfield from Rossendale South to Rossendale West. We are adopting this amendment as part of our final recommendations. This change would mean a stronger and more identifiable boundary – the A680 – between the divisions.
Rossendale West	1	4%	This division comprises a rural area in the west of the borough, as well as a part of Haslingden.	As mentioned above, based on submissions we received during the consultation on our draft recommendations, we are amending the boundaries of this division as part of our final recommendations.
Whitworth & Bacup	1	-3%	This division is largely made up of Whitworth parish, and also contains part of Bacup.	The borough-wide submission received proposed changing the name of this division, to better reflect the communities within it. We are amending this division's name as part of our final recommendations.

South Ribble Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Leyland Central	1	2%	This division comprises most of Leyland town, as well as part of the Moss Side community.	In the borough-wide submission we received, it was argued that including part of Moss Side in this division would not reflect community identities in this part of the borough. Our proposed division comprises three whole borough wards, and enjoys good electoral equality. We are therefore not persuaded we have received sufficient evidence to amend our draft recommendations here.
Leyland South	1	-1%	This division comprises the Wade Hall community and part of Buckshaw village.	We did not receive any submissions directly relating to this division, and so we confirm it as part of our final recommendations.
Lostock Hall & Bamber Bridge	1	5%	This division comprises the Bamber Bridge and Lostock Hall communities, and uses the M6 as part of its eastern boundary.	In a borough-wide submission we received, it was argued that this division would not reflect community identities. Our proposed division contains two whole borough wards, and part of another. We consider that this division has good road communication links within it and that it has good electoral equality, and we are therefore not persuaded to amend it in our final recommendations.
Moss Side & Farington	1	7%	This division comprises the area to the north and east of Leyland, and includes most of the Moss Side and the parish of Farington.	<p>As mentioned above, we received some submissions which opposed the way Moss Side had been split between our proposed divisions. It was argued that Farington and Moss Side do not have shared community links, and that our proposed divisions divide the communities in the area. Given the electoral imbalances in neighbouring divisions, we are unable to retain the existing arrangements here. Our proposed division largely consists of whole borough wards, and the division has good electoral equality.</p> <p>While we acknowledge the depth of feeling regarding how communities are split between divisions, we consider that our proposals represent the best balance of our statutory</p>

				criteria, and we have decided not to amend our proposed division.
Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale	1	8%	This division comprises parts of both Penwortham and Walton-le-Dale.	<p>We received a submission from a parish council which put forward an amendment to a parish ward name we had proposed. We also received submissions which opposed the creation of this division. Those submissions argued that Penwortham and Walton-le-Dale do not have a shared community identity. Our proposed division comprises two whole borough wards and part of another (Middleforth), meaning that although the division splits Penwortham, a recognisable boundary is used. The existing electoral divisions in this area of the borough both have electoral variances which are greater than 10% from the county average and therefore require amendment. Given the number of electors in this area, and the need to propose divisions with good electoral equality, we have had to divide some communities – including Penwortham, Walton-le-Dale and Bamber Bridge – between divisions. While our proposed division contains parts of separate communities, we have used recognisable boundaries where we have split communities.</p> <p>We are therefore not amending our proposed divisions as part of our final recommendations.</p>
Penwortham West	1	9%	This division comprises the majority of Penwortham town, and part of Hutton parish.	<p>The two borough-wide proposals we received opposed our draft recommendations, arguing that Penwortham is split in a way that does not reflect community identities. Due to the number of electors in Penwortham, it is necessary to split it between two divisions. As mentioned above, we consider that our proposed split of Penwortham has strong and identifiable boundaries, largely following main roads, and partly following the railway line. We have also followed part of the new borough ward for the boundary between this division and Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale. The</p>

				<p>borough-wide proposal we received proposed a split of Penwortham which would not have reflected communities, and did not use clear and identifiable division boundaries.</p> <p>We are satisfied that our proposed division meets our statutory criteria. We are adopting this division as part of our final recommendations.</p>
South Ribble East	1	5%	This division comprises the rural area in the east of the borough, as well as Gregson Lane, and includes the parishes of Cuerdale and Samlesbury.	The two borough-wide submissions we received expressed opposition to our proposed division, arguing that it splits the community of Walton-le-Dale. Our proposed division contains the rural area in the north-east of the borough, and in order to achieve good electoral equality – here and in neighbouring divisions – we have included areas to the west of the M6 and M61 motorways. We consider that this division represents the best balance of our statutory criteria, and we are adopting it as part of our final recommendations.
South Ribble West	1	4%	This division comprises the rural area in the west of the borough, and includes the parishes of Little Hoole, Longton and Much Hoole, as well as part of the parish of Hutton.	We received a submission from a parish council in this division, arguing that it did not wish to be split between two divisions. Our proposed division boundary follows the new borough ward boundary in this area, which we consider provides for effective and convenient local government. We have therefore decided not to amend our proposed division in this area.

West Lancashire Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Burscough & Rufford	1	-6%	This division comprises the parishes of Burscough and Rufford and part of Scarisbrick parish.	We received a submission from a local resident who argued that the communities of Burscough and Rufford should not be in the same division. We do not consider that persuasive evidence has been provided to warrant amending our proposed division here, and we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.

Ormskirk	1	-1%	This division comprises the majority of Ormskirk town.	We received three submissions relating to this division, one of which argued that the division should contain areas of Ormskirk town that we had placed in West Lancashire East division. The current Ormskirk West division has too few electors to meet our statutory criterion of good electoral equality. Therefore, it was necessary to include parts of Ormskirk town in West Lancashire East division. We are confirming this division as part of our final recommendations.
Skelmersdale Central	1	0%	This division comprises the centre of Skelmersdale, and has the M58 as part of its southern boundary.	We did not receive any submissions specifically relating to these divisions, and we are confirming them all as part of our final recommendations.
Skelmersdale East	1	1%	This division covers the east of Skelmersdale town, and also contains the parishes of Up Holland and Wrightington.	
Skelmersdale West	1	0%	This division comprises the western and northern parts of Skelmersdale town.	
West Lancashire East	1	-3%	This division comprises the parishes of Bickerstaffe, Bispham, Dalton, Hilledale, Lathom, Lathom South, Newburgh, Parbold and Simonswood, and part of Aughton parish as well as part of Ormskirk town.	
				As mentioned above, we received some submissions relating to this division's boundary with Ormskirk division. We also received some submissions regarding Aughton parish, which we have split between this division and West Lancashire West division. In order to achieve good electoral equality in this division, we have had to include part of the parish in West Lancashire West division. As part of our draft recommendations, we had proposed new parish warding arrangements for the Aughton parish. However, our proposed electoral division boundary will split the parish, but it will follow an existing parish ward boundary, so there is no requirement for us to provide new parish ward

				arrangements here. The electoral division boundaries that we have proposed will not be changed as part of our final recommendations.
West Lancashire North	1	5%	This division comprises the parishes of Hesketh-with-Becconsall, North Meols and Tarleton.	We did not receive any submissions relating to this division, and we are confirming it as part of our final recommendations.
West Lancashire West	1	-4%	This division comprises the parishes of Downholland, Great Altcar and Halsall, as well as parts of Aughton and Scarisbrick parishes.	<p>As mentioned above, we received some submissions regarding our proposal to split Aughton parish between this division and West Lancashire East division.</p> <p>We also received a submission reiterating support for an alternative pattern of divisions in the borough, which would mean that Scarisbrick parish was partly in a division with Ormskirk. We considered that our proposed division, which keeps Scarisbrick partly in this division and partly in Burscough & Rufford division, better reflects community identities in this area.</p> <p>We consider that our proposed divisions reflect our statutory criteria, and we therefore confirm our proposed division here as final.</p>

Wyre Borough

Division name	Number of Cllrs	Variance 2021	Description	Detail
Cleveleys East	1	-6%	This division comprises part of Cleveleys and part of Thornton.	In the borough-wide submission that we received, it was proposed to move a small area of this division into Thornton & Hambleton division. However, our proposed boundary in

				this area will be coterminous with the borough ward boundary, and we are not persuaded to amend our proposed division here.
Cleveleys South & Carleton	1	-8%	This division comprises parts of Cleveleys, Thornton and Carleton, as well as part of Marsh Mill.	We did not receive any submissions relating to these divisions, aside from the borough-wide submission which expressed support for all of the divisions. We are therefore confirming our draft recommendations as final here.
Fleetwood East	1	-3%	This division comprises the north and east of Fleetwood town, and uses the River Wyre as its eastern boundary.	
Fleetwood West & Cleveleys West	1	4%	This division comprises the majority of Fleetwood town, and the western part of Cleveleys.	
Poulton-le-Fylde	1	2%	This division contains the town of Poulton-le-Fylde.	In addition to the borough-wide submission, which supported this division, we received one other submission which also expressed support. We therefore confirm this division as part of our final recommendations.
Thornton & Hambleton	1	-7%	This division contains much of the community of Thornton, part of Marsh Mill and the parishes of Hambleton, Out Rawcliffe, and Stalmine-with-Staynall.	We received three submissions relating to this division, and it was referred to in the borough-wide submission received. Some of the parish councils argued that this division would be dominated by the urban area of Thornton, to the detriment of the more rural area to the east of the River Wyre. These parishes stated that they would prefer to be in a more rural-focused division, such as neighbouring Wyre Rural Central. However, in order to achieve good electoral equality, in this division and elsewhere in the borough we have included Thornton with some of the parishes to its east. To include the parishes of Hambleton, Out Rawcliffe and Stalmine-with-Staynall in Wyre Rural Central division would leave Thornton & Hambleton with an electoral variance of

				<p>-45%. This is clearly too high an electoral variance for us to accept.</p> <p>Furthermore, some of the existing divisions in this part of the borough have electoral variances which are far higher than we would usually recommend. Therefore we have decided to create this division which spans both sides of the estuary and which has good electoral equality.</p>
Wyre Rural Central	1	-7%	<p>This division contains the parishes of Forton, Great Eccleston, Inskip-with-Sowerby, Preesall, Pilling, Upper Rawcliffe-with-Tarnacre and Winmarleigh.</p>	<p>In addition to the borough-wide submission, we received three submissions from parish councils regarding these divisions. The borough-wide submission suggested including the parishes of Nateby and Myerscough & Bilsborrow in Wyre Rural East, rather than Wyre Rural Central as we had initially proposed. Moving Myerscough & Bilsborrow parish was also supported by one of the submissions from parish councils that we received. We consider that moving these two parishes improves the electoral equality in both divisions, and provides a better reflection of community identities.</p> <p>One of the parishes expressed concern that Wyre Rural Central division would affect school catchment areas. Another submission stated that while it would prefer to retain the status quo, it accepted the proposed division arrangements.</p> <p>The borough-wide submission proposed moving Cabus parish in to Wyre Rural Central. However, our proposals mean that Garstang town will be entirely within one division, which we consider provides the best reflection of community identities in this area.</p>
Wyre Rural East	1	5%	<p>This division comprises the parishes of Barnacre-with-Bonds, Bleasdale, Cabus, Catterall, Claughton, Garstang, Kirkland, Myerscough & Bilsborrow, Nateby and Nether Wyresdale.</p>	

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

	Final recommendations	
	2015	2021
Number of councillors	84	84
Number of electoral divisions	82	82
Average number of electors per councillor	10,709	11,083
Number of divisions with a variance more than 10% from the average	7	2
Number of divisions with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

Final recommendation

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

Mapping

Sheet 1, Map 1 illustrates in outline form the proposed divisions for Lancashire.

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

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

arrangements.

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

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

Final recommendation
Brierfield Parish Council should return 13 parish councillors, as at present, representing five wards: Central (returning two members), East (returning two members), North (returning three members), South (returning three members) and West (returning three members). The proposed parish ward boundaries are illustrated and named on Map 1.

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

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

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

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

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

Final recommendation

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

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

Final recommendation

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

3 What happens next?

60 We have now completed our review of Lancashire County Council. The recommendations must now be approved by Parliament. A draft Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in Parliament. Subject to parliamentary scrutiny, the new electoral arrangements will come into force at the local elections in 2017.

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Final recommendations for Lancashire County Council

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
Burnley Borough								
1	Burnley Central East	1	11,132	11,132	4%	11,073	11,073	0%
2	Burnley Central West	1	10,831	10,831	1%	10,773	10,773	-3%
3	Burnley North East	1	10,491	10,491	-2%	10,435	10,435	-6%
4	Burnley Rural	1	11,338	11,338	6%	11,278	11,278	2%
5	Burnley South West	1	11,388	11,388	6%	11,327	11,327	2%
6	Padiham & Burnley West	1	10,591	10,591	-1%	10,535	10,535	-5%
Chorley Borough								
7	Chorley Central	1	10,839	10,839	1%	10,895	10,895	-2%
8	Chorley North	1	10,124	10,124	-5%	10,198	10,198	-8%
9	Chorley Rural East	1	9,433	9,433	-12%	9,928	9,928	-10%
10	Chorley Rural West	1	10,683	10,683	0%	10,766	10,766	-3%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
11	Chorley South	1	11,322	11,322	6%	11,818	11,818	7%
12	Clayton with Whittle	1	10,013	10,013	-6%	10,859	10,859	-2%
13	Euxton, Buckshaw & Astley	1	11,048	11,048	3%	11,781	11,781	6%
14	Hoghton with Wheelton	1	10,301	10,301	-4%	10,242	10,242	-8%
Fylde Borough								
15	Fylde East	1	10,777	10,777	1%	12,185	12,185	10%
16	Fylde South	1	8,857	8,857	-17%	9,900	9,900	-11%
17	Fylde West	1	10,198	10,198	-5%	11,682	11,682	5%
18	Lytham	1	10,669	10,669	0%	11,007	11,007	-1%
19	St Annes North	1	10,451	10,451	-2%	11,314	11,314	2%
20	St Annes South	1	10,506	10,506	-2%	11,872	11,872	7%
Hyndburn Borough								
21	Accrington North	1	10,240	10,240	-4%	10,317	10,317	-7%
22	Accrington South	1	10,115	10,115	-6%	10,206	10,206	-8%

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

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

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
34	Morecambe South	1	11,177	11,177	4%	11,255	11,255	2%
35	Skerton	1	10,399	10,399	-3%	10,472	10,472	-6%
Pendle Borough								
36	Brierfield & Nelson West	1	11,281	11,281	5%	11,686	11,686	5%
37	Nelson East	1	11,755	11,755	10%	12,142	12,142	10%
38	Pendle Central	1	10,827	10,827	1%	11,382	11,382	3%
39	Pendle Hill	1	11,388	11,388	6%	12,132	12,132	9%
40	Pendle Rural	2	21,342	10,671	0%	22,411	11,205	1%
Preston City								
41	Preston Central East	1	11,345	11,345	6%	11,541	11,541	4%
42	Preston Central West	1	11,095	11,095	4%	11,134	11,134	0%
43	Preston City	1	10,974	10,974	2%	11,012	11,012	-1%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
44	Preston East	1	11,452	11,452	7%	11,493	11,493	4%
45	Preston North	1	11,384	11,384	6%	11,542	11,542	4%
46	Preston Rural	1	9,164	9,164	-14%	10,678	10,678	-4%
47	Preston South East	1	11,819	11,819	10%	11,875	11,875	7%
48	Preston South West	1	11,552	11,552	8%	11,737	11,737	6%
49	Preston West	1	10,616	10,616	-1%	11,076	11,076	0%
Ribble Valley Borough								
50	Clitheroe	1	12,253	12,253	14%	12,531	12,531	13%
51	Longridge with Bowland	1	11,232	11,232	5%	11,463	11,463	3%
52	Ribble Valley North East	1	11,691	11,691	9%	12,086	12,086	9%
53	Ribble Valley South West	1	11,923	11,923	11%	12,217	12,217	10%
Rossendale Borough								
54	Mid-Rossendale	1	11,613	11,613	8%	12,235	12,235	10%

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
55	Rossendale East	1	10,505	10,505	-2%	11,005	11,005	-1%
56	Rossendale South	1	9,782	9,782	-9%	10,280	10,280	-7%
57	Rossendale West	1	11,013	11,013	3%	11,490	11,490	4%
58	Whitworth & Bacup	1	10,228	10,228	-4%	10,757	10,757	-3%
South Ribble Borough								
59	Leyland Central	1	11,106	11,106	4%	11,324	11,324	2%
60	Leyland South	1	10,486	10,486	-2%	10,932	10,932	-1%
61	Lostock Hall & Bamber Bridge	1	11,448	11,448	7%	11,642	11,642	5%
62	Moss Side & Farington	1	9,326	9,326	-13%	11,866	11,866	7%
63	Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale	1	10,395	10,395	-3%	11,920	11,920	8%
64	Penwortham West	1	11,871	11,871	11%	12,042	12,042	9%
65	South Ribble East	1	10,515	10,515	-2%	11,667	11,667	5%
66	South Ribble West	1	10,983	10,983	3%	11,518	11,518	4%

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

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

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

	Division name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2015)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2021)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
78	Fleetwood West & Cleveleys West	1	11,204	11,204	5%	11,513	11,513	4%
79	Poulton-le-Fylde	1	10,994	10,994	3%	11,339	11,339	2%
80	Thornton & Hambleton	1	10,034	10,034	-6%	10,306	10,306	-7%
81	Wyre Rural Central	1	9,970	9,970	-7%	10,268	10,268	-7%
82	Wyre Rural East	1	11,380	11,380	6%	11,674	11,674	5%
	Totals	84	899,555	–	–	930,978	–	–
	Averages	–	–	10,709	–	–	11,083	–

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

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

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

Local authority

- Lancashire County Council

District councils

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

Political groups and parties

- Chorley Conservatives
- Conservative Group on Lancashire County Council (sent two submissions)
- Conservative Group on Pendle Borough Council
- Conservative Group on West Lancashire Borough Council
- Liberal Democrat Group on Ribble Valley Borough Council
- Pendle Liberal Democrats
- Ribble Valley Conservative Association
- Rossendale & Darwen Conservative Association

Local organisations

- Red Rose Sports Club
- Thornton Action Group

County and District councillors

- Councillor M. Adams (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor J. Addison (Hyndburn Borough Council)
- Councillor N. Ashraf (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor N. Butterworth (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor R. Carroll (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Clempson (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor S. Cockburn-Price (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor T. Cooney (Pendle Borough Council)

- Councillor P. Cox (Hyndburn Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Dad (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor L. Davy (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor B. Dawson (Hyndburn Borough Council)
- Councillor G. Dowding (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor G. Dowling (West Lancashire Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Foxley (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor M. France (Chorley Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Goulthorp (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Green (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor M. Horsfield (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Iqbal (Pendle Borough Council and Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor G. Molineux (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor N. McEvoy (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Mills (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor J. Nixon (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor T. O’Kane (Hyndburn Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Otter (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor B. Parkinson (Hyndburn Borough Council)
- Councillor M. Perks (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor M. Sakib (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor A. Schofield (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor C. Wakeford (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor G. Waugh (Pendle Borough Council)
- Councillor D. Whipp (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor P. White (Lancashire County Council)
- Councillor N. Younis (Pendle Borough Council)

Parish councillors

- Councillor A. Gaffney (Wilpshire Parish Council)
- Councillor C. Lennox (Astley Village Parish Council)

Parish and Town councils

- Anderton Parish Council
- Aughton Parish Council
- Barnoldswick Town Council
- Bickerstaffe Parish Council
- Bowland Forest Higher Parish Council
- Brindle and Houghton Parish Councils (joint submission)
- Catterall Parish Council
- Coppull Parish Council
- Earby Parish Council
- Farington Parish Council

- Foulridge Parish Council
- Gressingham Parish Council
- Hambleton Parish Council
- Heskin Parish Council
- Hutton Parish Council
- Kirkham Town Council
- Medlar-with-Wesham Town Council
- Myerscough & Bilsborrow Parish Council
- Nelson Town Council
- Newton-with-Clifton Parish Council
- Penwortham Town Council
- Pilling Parish Council
- St Anne's Town Council
- Stalmine with Staynall Parish Council
- Treales, Roseacre & Wharles Parish Council
- Wheelton Parish Council
- Wiswell Parish Council

MP/Peer

- Andrew Stephenson MP
- Baron Greaves

Local residents

- 59 local residents (we also received around 800 pro-forma letters from Pendle residents)

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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

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

