

Report of	Meeting	Date
Chief Executive	Council	21 July 2015

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT – ELECTORAL REVIEW OF LANCASHIRE

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. This report is a supplementary to the report on to the Electoral Review of Lancashire report and should be read in conjunction with that agenda item.
2. This supplement outlines the proposed response by the Council to the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) review of county electoral division boundaries within Lancashire.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

3. Accepting that political discussions are to be had and on the basis that the proposals outlined in this report are the results of discussions at an All Party Leaders meeting, the recommendation is for members to agree to the proposed Council response to the LGBCE regarding the boundary review and to the submission of the two Chorley county division configuration options included in this report.

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

CORPORATE PRIORITIES

4. 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	√

BACKGROUND

5. Following the drafting of the original report on the Electoral Review of Lancashire an all party leaders meeting was held to discuss the response to the LGBCE and the suggested submission of any proposals. From the meeting a proposed response was agreed together with 2 possible scenarios re the future configuration of county division boundaries for Chorley
6. The suggested response is as follows:

- a. The Council feel that it is undesirable for such a review to take place in isolation without any regard to the make-up of borough ward boundaries and that it would have made more sense to review all boundaries at the same time.
- b. It is also felt that the timing of the review is flawed in that it would have been preferable for it to have commenced at the start of the County Council electoral cycle instead of half way through. This would have provided more time for discussions to have taken place and for proposals to have been developed.
- c. It is imperative that the timetable outlined by the LGBCE is adhered to with the final recommendation published no later than 5 April 2016. Should there be any slippage to this then our opinion is that the review should be postponed until after the county elections in May 2017.
- d. As a part of the review process and taking into account current and forecasted figures for Chorley and Lancashire we are submitting 2 proposed options for the future county division configuration for the Chorley electoral area. Whilst we are submitting 2 proposals each option carries the same weight and we have no preference for either one other than one of them, be adopted. Both these options include the premise that the number of electoral divisions in Chorley be increased by 1 from the current 7 to 8 divisions.

OPTIONS FOR SUBMISSION

7. The 2 options being proposed are as outlined in appendices 4 and 5. Both these options comply with the LGBCE criteria as outlined in item 12 of the original report.
8. Option A is a proposal for 8 divisions with whole borough wards contained within each division but with divisions reconfigured from the current to allow for 8 divisions instead of 7. This would keep electorate figures per division for the borough within the overall criteria for variance from the county average. This proposal is attached as **Appendix 4**.
9. Option B is similar to A in that it also allows for 8 divisions and again is designed to allow for electorate figures per division within the whole borough to meet the variance criteria. This option also provides for polling district 04C to be included within the same county division as polling districts 13A and 13B. These polling districts together make up the whole of the Parish of Coppull and as such this option would allow for the parish to be included within the same division. This proposal is attached as **Appendix 5**.
10. Both these options are based on forecasted electorate figures for 2021. Both also include a number of proposed names for new divisions however at this stage these are suggested titles only.

IMPLICATIONS OF REPORT

11. 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

12. There are no financial implications for the council.

COMMENTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

13. There are no comments.

**GARY HALL
CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

There are no background papers to this report.

Report Author	Ext	Date	Doc ID
Phil Davies	5131	17 July 2015	***