

SPECIAL COUNCIL

**TUESDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER 2015, 6.30 PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER, TOWN HALL, CHORLEY**

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the above meeting of the Council, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was published, and also an additional agenda item which is item 12 A below

Agenda No Item

6A ALTERNATIVE CORPORATE STRATEGY

To consider the attached report of the Conservative Group.

(Pages 162 -
173)

10 ELECTORAL REVIEW OF LANCASHIRE

To consider the attached report of the Chief Executive.

(Pages 174 -
227)

12A NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Graham Dunn

“There is a growing demand and insufficient provision of social housing for rent in the Chorley Borough area, and the ‘Right to Buy’ scheme as proposed by the government in its current format presents difficulties to Chorley Borough Council in its efforts to see an increase in the supply of new appropriate housing on a replacement basis when a dwelling is sold. Therefore Chorley Council proposes the following:

- That the government follows the leadership of the Scottish Government in reversing the Right to Buy scheme for council houses.
- That the proposal to extend the Right to Buy scheme to housing associations be abolished
- That the proposal to manage welfare spending by controlling social rents be abolished as this goes against the move in 2012 to relinquish central government control and to allow councils and other local housing providers more freedom to manage their housing portfolios.
- That the Chief Executive of Chorley Council sends this resolution to the Secretary and Shadow Secretary of State for DCLG and the Housing and Shadow Housing Minister, the 2 MP’s whose constituencies cover our Borough, and the various Housing Associations which operate within our Borough boundary. “

GARY HALL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Electronic agendas sent to Members of the Council

If you need this information in a different format, such as larger print or translation, please get in touch on 515151 or chorley.gov.uk



Report of	Meeting	Date
Leader of the Conservative Group / Deputy Leader of the Conservative Group	Policy Council	24 November 2015

CORPORATE STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT 2015

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To present the Conservative Group's proposed Corporate Strategy alongside background information about how the Vision, Priorities and Objectives were developed.

Confidential report Please bold as appropriate	Yes	No
--	-----	-----------

BACKGROUND

2. In readiness for the annual Policy Council meeting in November, the Conservative Group has undertaken work to identify their key priorities for the Borough and develop an alternative Corporate Strategy that can be used in debating the refresh of the Corporate Strategy and budget.
3. The discussions have been based on information and analysis within a big issues briefing note and a series of meetings with both shadow cabinet members and members of the wider group.
4. The strategy aims to add to the debate in the development and approval of the organisation's Corporate Strategy for 2015/16 to 2017/18 and the budget for 2016/17.

DEVELOPING THE STRATEGY

5. The development of the Conservative Group's Corporate Strategy has been based on a 'Big Issues' briefing note, which presented intelligence and analysis of the position of the organisation and borough in terms of demographic change, population health information and resident satisfaction. In addition, it included information about the resourcing of the organisation and current performance.
6. The vision, priorities and objectives remain the same as presented last year; however the projects have been reviewed with a number of new projects added and projects proposed last year updated in terms of their scope to reflect the current position.

PROPOSED CORPORATE STRATEGY

7. The Corporate Strategy proposed by the Conservative Group is attached as Appendix A. The strategy’s vision, values, strategic priorities and objectives are set out below.

8. The strategy sets the vision ‘To make Chorley Borough a healthy and prosperous place to live, work and play’.

9. The vision is underpinned by core values, which the organisation would use in approaching all its work. The values are:
 - Openness and transparency
 - Health and wellbeing
 - Value for money

10. Four strategic priorities and associated objectives then support the vision, and will guide the organisation in delivering the strategy. They are:

Priority 1: Providing quality community services and facilities	
Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improve the delivery of services that meet the needs of residents b. Provide services and facilities that promote health and wellbeing c. Support and encourage resident participation and ownership in local projects d. Provide support to community groups and volunteers to ensure continuity/sustainability
Priority 2: Providing opportunities for all Chorley residents	
Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Provide equality of quality of access to housing, employment and education b. Treat all residents of the Borough equally c. Consult all age groups in the future shaping the borough
Priority 3: Develop the Chorley borough’s economy	
Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop a Chorley wide identity b. Create a positive environment for business c. Provide support to Chorley businesses to create and sustain local jobs d. Optimise the town centre offer to match market need
Priority 4: Continually improve the efficiency of the Council	
Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maximise the use of time and money b. Drive value for money and success throughout the Council c. Reduce the debt of the Council d. Encourage private enterprise investment e. Minimise the amount Chorley residents spend on Council Tax

PROJECTS

- 11. The strategy will be delivered through a series of projects over the period of the strategy. An overview of the proposed projects is included at Appendix B.

IMPLICATIONS OF REPORT

- 12. This report has implications in the following areas and the relevant Directors' comments are included:

Finance		Customer Services	
Human Resources		Equality and Diversity	
Legal		Integrated Impact Assessment required?	
No significant implications in this area	✓	Policy and Communications	

COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER

- 13. The report sets out the Conservative group's proposals for an alternative Corporate Strategy. The proposed projects include some projects which could be delivered within existing resources, some projects which would require additional funding and also some projects which would aim to deliver savings. Further details of the budget implications will be presented as part of the alternative budget proposals in March 2016.

COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

- 14. No comments

CLLR PAUL LEADBETTER
LEADER OF THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP

CLLR GREG MORGAN
DEPUTY LEADER OF THE CONSERVATIVE GROUP

There are no background papers to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Our vision is to make Chorley Borough a healthy and prosperous place to live, work and play

Our core values are:

Openness and Transparency

Health and Wellbeing

Value for Money

We will improve the quality of life throughout Chorley Borough through commitment to:

Priorities	Provide quality community services and facilities	Providing opportunities for all Chorley residents	Develop the Chorley Borough's Economy	Continually improve the efficiency of the council
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the delivery of services that meet the needs of residents • Provide services and facilities that promote health and wellbeing • Support and encourage resident participation and ownership in local projects • Provide support to community groups and volunteers to ensure continuity/ sustainability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide equality of access to housing, employment and education • Treat all residents of the borough equally • Consult all age groups in the future shaping of the borough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a Chorley wide identity • Create a positive environment for business • Provide support to Chorley businesses to create and sustain local jobs • Optimise the town centre offer to match market needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maximise the use of time and money • Drive value for money and success throughout the Council • Reduce the debt of the Council • Encourage private enterprise investment • Minimise the amount Chorley residents spend on Council Tax
Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote and support community food growing • Working together to improve local communities • Support Parish Councils/ neighbourhood areas • Embed time credits into community groups • Promote and encourage community management of facilities • Deliver the Friday Street health centre • CCTV provision • Deliver the Extra Care Scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estate adoption • Develop a rural enterprise team • Develop policies to ensure community facilities match housing developments • Work with partners to deliver affordable public transport across the borough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create more high paid jobs in Chorley • Revitalise rural service centres and deliver a 'shop local' campaign across the borough • Expand offer of grants to businesses and shops across the borough • Deliver a new town centre and car park masterplan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase productivity across all Council services • Establish a consultancy business for front and back office support and improvement • Undertake a comprehensive review of all council services/shared services • Implement a staff suggestion scheme

We will provide what the people of Chorley Borough value at a time and place they want it to the standards they expect at a cost they can afford

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX B – PROJECT OVERVIEWS

Provide quality community services and facilities

Promote and support community food growing

Building on the work undertaken with the Lancashire Wildlife Trust, this project would work with parish councils, RSLs, Groundwork and local communities to develop a specified number of community food growing schemes. Food growing schemes could also be supported through time credits and a communications campaign. Benefits could potentially include: Promotion of healthier lifestyles (people are more active and aware of healthy food); Promotion of inter-generational activities; community cohesion; low cost fresh produce.

Working together to improve local communities

The aim of this project is to engage with partner agencies, such as Police, Fire Rescue, Parish Council's, LCC, Health and housing providers as well as local community groups to develop plans for areas of the borough. The project will look at identifying what actions partners and local community groups need to undertake to improve the quality of life, health and wellbeing for people in the neighbourhood areas. This will involve developing short term and long term plans for local area, through identifying gaps, looking at what work can be undertaken to fill the gaps, and exploring how we can better co-ordinate and/or collate their individual plans in order to collectively deliver better results for residents in their local areas. Local community groups will be encouraged and supported to work with agencies to decide what happens in their local area and develop pride and ownership in the delivery of any actions developing a more sustainable approach to neighbourhood working.

Support Parish Councils/Neighbourhood areas

Recognising and maximising the role that Parish Councils and local community groups in non-parished areas do and could further play in improving the local area. This may include providing support to build capacity as well as providing clearer links from the Council's website to Parish Councils and local community groups. This has a close link with the project to work together to improve local communities.

Embed time credits into community groups

This project would embed the existing time credits programme into community groups to ensure its ongoing sustainability. It may also include developing a self-sustaining currency system and developing an online system which would require minimal central administration.

Promote and encourage community management of facilities

This project is based on previous projects to transfer community centres into community management, but it aims to expand and develop the principles to other assets such as play areas and open spaces. It aims to develop greater feeling of ownership and pride in the local community, and offer a more cost-effective method for managing assets.

Deliver the Friday Street health centre

Using the capital budget provision already set aside, work with partners to finalise and deliver the Friday Street health centre.

CCTV Provision

This project will deliver improved CCTV infrastructure as well as a new support contract for the maintenance and support.

Deliver the Extra Care Scheme

This project will look to deliver a purpose built housing scheme for the over 55's with community facilities and flexible 24 hour domiciliary care while promoting independence and social integration for the residents.

On completion this facility will provide the area with increased housing provision supporting outcomes from the Lancashire Extra Care & Specialised Housing Strategy. It will also become a long term asset for the council, reducing costs to social care budget, meeting health and wellbeing outcomes while providing long term revenue income for the council.

We will work closely with our health partners to deliver this scheme, however if the anticipated funding streams are not achieved we propose to review options to team up with private sector partners.

Potential Measures:

- % people satisfied with their neighbourhood as a place to live
- % of people who regularly participate in volunteering
- No. of volunteering hours earned
- No. of new volunteers recruited
- No. of community groups engaged in time credits
- Number of services/facilities in community management
- % increase in services/facilities managed by local communities
- The number of communities who have expressed an interest in managing local services/facilities.

Providing opportunity for all Chorley residents

Estate adoption

To improve the process of the adoption of estates following the completion of new housing developments. While this matter has been the subject of an Overview and scrutiny task group in 2012, the slow adoption of estates remains an issue. This project would seek to successfully complete any remaining O&S recommendations and identify and implement any further actions which could help to speed up and improve this process.

Develop a rural enterprise team

Develop a service which provides tailored support and advice to businesses and individuals in rural communities. In addition, this would include establishing a rural team, similar to the 'town team' engaging rural businesses and parish councils. The third element involves supporting businesses and individuals to access funding through the Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) and establishing a grants package to support business to access the RDPE funding (match funding).

Develop policies that ensure community facilities match housing developments

Undertake a review of policies to ensure that housing developments in an area do not overwhelm local services. Carry out integrated impact assessments for all new housing developments and in some cases commission full public health impact assessments.

Work with partners to deliver affordable and quality public transport across the borough

Work with Lancashire County Council and providers to ensure that all communities across the borough are served with a public transport service that is useful and affordable.

In particular the aim would be to support people in outlying areas who may be isolated or lack access to transport to access services or visit people/places in the borough. This may be delivered through working with Central Lancashire dial a ride and expanding/developing their existing service provision to Chorley through mini bus and car share schemes.

Potential measures:

- Number of rural businesses intensively advised
- Number/value of grants provided to rural businesses
- Amount of match funding accessed by rural businesses
- % of housing developments with impact assessments
- % of impact assessment actions completed
- % of rural bus routes retained

Develop the Chorley Borough's Economy

Create more high paid jobs in Chorley

Whilst Chorley has good employment and education levels, many Chorley residents have to travel outside of the borough to find jobs which are better paid than those available in Chorley. This project will aim to specifically focus on attracting business to Chorley which can offer better paid jobs for local residents and opportunities for young people to progress into a professional career, for example in high tech or health sectors. This could be delivered through:

- Working with UCLAN, local colleges, training providers and employers to help local people develop their skills, qualifications and readiness to progress into higher skilled and higher paid jobs.
- Developing a local Centre of Excellence to train and educate a workforce capable of undertaking high skilled and high paid jobs.
- Appointing an Inward Investment Manager to identify new opportunities and funding streams.
- Developing an inward investment campaign targeted at high tech/health sector or generally better paid employment sector – to attract and encourage them to relocate to Chorley.
- Working with existing businesses (who offer well paid work) to promote jobs opportunities to local people first.

Revitalise rural service centres and deliver a 'shop local' campaign across the borough

Support shops and businesses in rural service centres (links to/covered by the expansion of grants across the borough and the development of a rural enterprise team).

Complementing the national campaign, the campaign will encourage people to use the shops and businesses across the borough to support the local economy and local area.

Expand the offer of grants to businesses and shops across the borough

Expand the offer of grants (shop front improvement grants, shop floor refurbishment grants and business rate subsidy scheme) to businesses and shops across the borough rather than being focussed on businesses specifically in the town centre and a limited number of service centres. A review of the criteria and approach to the grants should also be carried out to consider the sustainability of businesses receiving the grants and try to reduce the numbers of businesses which receive grants and subsequently close within 24 months of receiving our support.

Deliver a new town centre and car park masterplan

Following Council approval to proceed with the Market Walk Extension, work now needs to be undertaken to revisit and refresh the town centre masterplan and also to develop a

comprehensive car parking strategy which addresses the towns car parking needs both now and in the medium term.

Potential measures:

- Shop/Unit vacancy rates - outside of the town centre
- No. grants awarded
- % grants awarded to businesses in outlying areas
- The number of town centre visits

Continually improve the efficiency of the Council

Increase productivity across all Council services

This project will seek to improve staff productivity across all services areas, to both enable the Council to deal with the inevitable increases in demand for services which will take place over the next few years and also to generate savings options of up to £1m. Some services are effectively using management data which includes work volumes and processing times to improve staff productivity, and it is intended that this approach would be rolled out across all Council services as far as possible. In some areas it appears that if all staff were working at average productivity levels or above that the same demand could be met with 30% less staff, or that the existing staff could take on more or higher volumes of work. To apply this across the board, could achieve over double the £1m target but would impact on the ability to deliver services.

Establish a consultancy business for front and back office support and improvement

Using existing resources, and improved productivity, market the services of back office functions to other organisations to recoup some of the cost of the back office.

Undertake a comprehensive review of all council services/shared services

A programme of value for money reviews to identify areas for savings, improvements and change across the organisation that can be implemented to improve performance. Working more closely with other authorities, particularly neighbouring authorities, should give the opportunity to improve services and to make cost savings. Work will be undertaken to identify services that could be shared, and to then explore and develop opportunities with other councils.

Implement a staff suggestion scheme

A scheme would be developed to encourage staff to make suggestions about how the council can be improved, to improve service delivery or to work more efficiently. Incorporated within this would be a staff introduction incentive scheme.

Potential measures:

- % increase in contracts generating an income for the Council
- Amount of additional income generated
- % of residents who feel that the Council provides value for money
- Staff satisfaction



Report of	Meeting	Date
Chief Executive	Council	24 November 2015

ELECTORAL REVIEW OF LANCASHIRE

PURPOSE OF REPORT

- The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) has issued draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancashire County Council. Consultation commenced on 17 November 2015 and is open until 11 January 2016 and Members are asked to submit any views on the draft recommendations.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

- Members are asked to consider the draft recommendations put forward for Lancashire with a view to responding to the LGBCE consultation by either:
 - agreeing the proposals; or
 - challenging the proposals and providing feedback.

Confidential report Please bold as appropriate	Yes	No

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- This report relates to the following Strategic Objectives:

Involving residents in improving their local area and equality of access for all		A strong local economy	
Clean, safe and healthy communities		An ambitious council that does more to meet the needs of residents and the local area	x

BACKGROUND

- On 21 July 2015, the full Council meeting considered early stage consultation from LGBCE on a review of the 82 County Council divisions across Lancashire. The review was triggered by 29 of those divisions having an electoral variance of more than 10% from the average electorate for an LCC division.
- The Council at that meeting, agreed to put forward a submission evidencing the need for 8 County Electoral divisions for Chorley based on the population growth forecast for Chorley and the number of divisions which were already currently outside the 10% variance in electorate. Two potential proposals for the revised configuration of the 8 divisions were submitted, both of which had the support of all political parties on the Council.

NEXT STAGE CONSULTATION: PROPOSALS FOR CHORLEY

6. On 17 November the LGBCE published its draft recommendations (attached as Appendix 1 to this report) which had been formulated, having considered representations made by the County Council and a number of district councils; parish and town councils; MPs; individual elected members; political groups, local organisations and residents. The proposals are coming to this Council meeting for consideration as there isn't another one before the close of consultation on 11 January.
7. The proposals retain the 84 County Council seats across Lancashire and include 8 rather than 7 Electoral Divisions for the area of Chorley Borough.

The detailed proposals for the 8 new Divisions largely follow those suggested by Chorley Council, in one of the proposals but with one significant change. The proposals are contained in paragraph 23 of the attached report, and in a schedule set out in pages 11 and 12 of the document.

IMPLICATIONS FOR CHORLEY BOROUGH

8. There are a number of electoral administration implications for the proposals which Members need to be aware of in relation to the new Chorley South and Chorley Central County Divisions under the draft recommendations.
9. From the original proposals, the Commission has suggested that 596 electors are moved from the Chorley South Division into Chorley Central. The LGBCE has arrived at this by redrawing the boundary, using Tootell Street as a division boundary. This is to "provide for a stronger and more recognisable boundary between these divisions, and would improve electoral equality". Co-terminosity with borough ward boundaries would change from 100% to 95% under these proposals.
10. The effect of this is to split the current polling district of 09D along this line. The 596 electors within the moved area would find themselves in a different County Division than the rest of the polling district. A complication arising from this, is that at present all electors within the polling district of 09D currently use the same polling station and will continue to do so for Chorley Borough Elections, however for the County Council elections the polling district would be split with the 596 moved electors voting in a different division. This would therefore leave the Council with the following options for voting arrangements:
 - For LCC elections, move the 596 electors to a different polling station. This would be straightforward from an administrative point of view but is not desirable for the voter, in that they would vote in different polling stations for different elections, which can only lead to confusion. Alternatively,
 - Within the existing polling premises, another polling station could be created resulting in there being two stations in the one location. One station would be for those voting in the Chorley South Division and the other station for the Chorley Central electors. This is not ideal, but would be the preferred option should these changes be implemented. The guidance on the location of polling stations says that the station should be situated in the actual voting area and as such this would clash with this rule, however in circumstances where there are no other options, it is permissible. In order to avoid elector confusion from year to year it could be deemed that we have no other viable options.
11. Members' views are requested on whether to make comment and challenge the changes proposed to Chorley Central and Chorley South Divisions; or to accept the draft recommendations and respond to the LGBCE accordingly.

IMPLICATIONS OF REPORT

12. This report has implications in the following areas and the relevant Directors' comments are included:

Finance		Customer Services	
Human Resources		Equality and Diversity	
Legal		Integrated Impact Assessment required?	
No significant implications in this area		Policy and Communications	

COMMENTS OF THE STATUTORY FINANCE OFFICER

13. There are no financial implications for the changes.

COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

14. There are no Monitoring officer comments.

**GARY HALL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

Report Author	Ext	Date	Doc ID
Carol Russell/Phil Davies	5196/5131	18 November 2015	***

Background Papers			
Document	Date	File	Place of Inspection
Report to Council – Electoral Review of Lancashire including supplementary information	21 July 2015		https://democracy.chorley.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=114&MId=4467&Ver=4
LGBCE Consultation information for Review of Lancashire			https://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/north-west/lancashire/lancashire-county-council

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft recommendations on the new electoral arrangements for Lancashire County Council

Electoral review

November 2015

Translations and other formats

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

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk

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

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2015

Contents

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

Appendices

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

Summary

Who we are

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

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

Electoral review

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

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

Why Lancashire?

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

Our proposals for Lancashire

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

Electoral arrangements

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

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

1 Introduction

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

What is an electoral review?

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

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

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

Consultation

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

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

How will the recommendations affect you?

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

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

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

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

Members of the Commission are:

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

Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

2 Analysis and draft recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Submissions received

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

Electorate figures

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

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

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

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

Council size

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

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

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

Division patterns

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Detailed divisions

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

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

⁴ Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

Burnley Borough

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

Chorley Borough

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

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

Fylde Borough

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

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

Hyndburn Borough

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

Lancaster City

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

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

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

Pendle Borough

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

Preston City

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

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

Ribble Valley Borough

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

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

Rossendale Borough

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

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

South Ribble Borough

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

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

West Lancashire Borough

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

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

Wyre Borough

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

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

				argued that it wanted to remain in a division with Garstang. However, including this parish in our Wyre Rural East division would result in an unacceptably high level of electoral inequality.
--	--	--	--	---

Conclusions

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

Table 1: Summary of electoral arrangements

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

Draft recommendation

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

Mapping

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

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

Parish electoral arrangements

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

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

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

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

Draft recommendation

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

3 Have your say

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A good pattern of divisions should:

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

Electoral equality:

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

Community identity:

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

Effective local government:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Equalities

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

Appendix A

Table A1: Draft recommendations for Lancashire County Council

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix B

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at

<http://www.lgbce.org.uk/current-reviews/north-west/lancashire/lancashire-county-council>

Local authority

- Lancashire County Council

District councils

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

MPs

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

County councillors

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

District councillors

- Councillor K. Martin
- Councillor A. Mills

Political groups and parties

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

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

Parish and town councils

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

Parish councillor

- Cllr T Young

Local organisations

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

Local residents

- Five local residents

Appendix C

Glossary and abbreviations

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

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