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Summary

Who we are and what we do

1 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.

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

Electoral review

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

Why Chorley?

4 We are conducting a review of Chorley Borough Council (‘the Council’) as the value of each vote in borough council elections varies depending on where you live in Chorley. Some councillors currently represent many more or fewer voters than others. This is ‘electoral inequality’. Our aim is to create ‘electoral equality’, where votes are as equal as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

Our proposals for Chorley

- Chorley should be represented by 42 councillors, five fewer than there are now.
- Chorley should have 14 wards, six fewer than there are now.
- The boundaries of all wards will change; none will stay the same.

Have your say

5 We are consulting on our draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 6 November 2018 to 14 January 2019. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to contribute to the design of the new wards – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when analysing all the views we receive.

6 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.
You have until 14 January 2019 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 25 for how to send us your response.

What is the Local Government Boundary Commission for England?

7 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England is an independent body set up by Parliament.¹

8 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Susan Johnson OBE
- Peter Maddison QPM
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Andrew Scallan CBE
- Chief Executive: Jolyon Jackson CBE

1 Introduction

This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Chorley are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of voters represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

What is an electoral review?

Our three main considerations are to:

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

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

We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Chorley. We then held a period of consultation on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

This review is being conducted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage starts</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2018</td>
<td>Number of councillors decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 June 2018</td>
<td>Start of consultation seeking views on new wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 September 2018</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2018</td>
<td>Publication of draft recommendations, start of second consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 January 2019</td>
<td>End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 March 2019</td>
<td>Publication of final recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How will the recommendations affect you?

14 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.
2 Analysis and draft recommendations

15 Legislation states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

16 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

17 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electorate of Chorley</td>
<td>85,575</td>
<td>90,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electors per councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having ‘good electoral equality’. All of our proposed wards for Chorley will have good electoral equality by 2024.

19 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to take into account any representations which are based on these issues.

Submissions received

20 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed at our offices by appointment, or on our website at www.lgbce.org.uk

Electorate figures

21 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2024, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2019. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 5% by 2024.

---

3 Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.
22 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

**Number of councillors**

23 Chorley Borough Council currently has 47 councillors. We have looked at evidence provided by the Council and have concluded that decreasing the number of councillors by five to 42 will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

24 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 42 councillors. As Chorley Borough Council elects by thirds (meaning it has elections in three out of every four years) there is a presumption in legislation\(^4\) that the Council will have a uniform pattern of three-councillor wards. We will only move away from this pattern of wards should we receive compelling evidence during consultation that applying such a pattern in a particular area of the authority would be inconsistent with satisfying the statutory criteria.

25 We received four submissions about the number of councillors in response to our consultation on warding arrangements. One respondent agreed with the 42-councillor scheme, while the other submissions either argued for a further reduction or increase. However, these submissions lacked detailed evidence as to why we should move away from the proposed number of 42 and how the authority would operate under an alternative council size. We have therefore based our draft recommendations on a 42-member council.

**Ward boundaries consultation**

26 We received 45 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included two borough-wide proposals from the Council and the Chorley Conservative Association. Both these schemes were based on a uniform pattern of three-councillor wards for 42 elected members.

27 Our draft recommendations are broadly based on the borough-wide proposals made by the Council. However, in some areas of the borough, we have also been persuaded by the Chorley Conservative Association’s scheme and other more localised submissions, which provided evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas, we considered that the proposals did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria, so we identified alternative boundaries. We also visited Chorley to look at the various proposals on the ground. This helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

\(^4\) Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 paragraph 2(3)(d) and paragraph 2(5)(c).
28 Our draft recommendations are for 14 three-councillor wards. 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.

29 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table on pages 27–8 and on the large map accompanying this report.

30 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

Draft recommendations

31 The tables and maps on pages 8–22 detail our draft recommendations for each area of the Chorley. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory criteria of:

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

---

Northern Chorley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckshaw &amp; Whittle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton East, Brindle &amp; Houghton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton West &amp; Cuerden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Buckshaw & Whittle

32 The Council and the Conservative Association proposed significantly different wards for the Buckshaw village and Whittle-le-Woods areas. The Council proposed a Buckshaw & Whittle ward containing the whole of Buckshaw village and the western part of Whittle-le-Woods parish. It proposed that the ward boundary follow the existing county division and parish ward boundaries in the east of the ward. The Conservative Association proposed that Buckshaw village be placed in a Buckshaw ward with Astley Village parish. It also proposed placing part of Whittle-le-Woods parish in a ward with part of Clayton-le-Woods parish, which is broadly similar to the current warding arrangements.

33 In addition to the borough-wide schemes, we received several submissions that related directly to the village of Buckshaw, a relatively new residential development that overlaps the borough boundary and is currently split between two wards. These submissions provided strong evidence that Buckshaw village should ideally be wholly contained in a single ward given its strong community identity. In addition, Astley Village Parish Council and a local resident argued against any proposal to keep Astley Village parish in a ward with Buckshaw village, emphasising the significant differences between the two areas.

34 Having carefully considered the evidence received, we have decided to place all of Buckshaw village in a single ward and place Astley Village in our proposed Chorley North ward (which is described in more detail later in this report).

35 However, while we note Buckshaw village’s distinct community identity, there will not be enough electors by 2024 for it to have its own three-councillor ward with good electoral equality. In consideration of this, we visited Chorley to see whether placing the village with part of Whittle-le-Woods parish, as proposed by the Council, would produce a cohesive ward. It appeared to us that Buckshaw village has good links with the Whittle-le-Woods area. In particular, we noted that Dawson Lane and Buckshaw Avenue represent good road links between the two areas. In light of this, we have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Council’s proposed Buckshaw & Whittle ward, which will have an electoral variance of 10% by 2024.

36 A small number of submissions also suggested that Buckshaw village should be wholly contained in one local authority. However, changing the external boundaries between Chorley and South Ribble boroughs falls outside the scope of the electoral review.

Clayton East, Brindle & Hoghton and Clayton West & Cuerden

37 The two borough-wide schemes proposed significantly different warding arrangements for the northern parishes of Clayton-le-Woods, Cuerden, Brindle and Hoghton. We examined both in detail and concluded that neither adequately satisfied our statutory criteria. For example, both the Council’s and the Conservative Association’s proposals for Clayton-le-Woods and Cuerden parishes provided wards with insufficiently clear road links. In particular, we noted that electors in Clayton Brook would have to travel outside of the borough or via a neighbouring ward to reach the rural parishes of Brindle and Hoghton. The Council’s proposal also divided the Clayton Brook community between wards by separating electors on Carr Meadow and Croft Meadow from the rest of the Council’s proposed Clayton North ward.
ward. Furthermore, the Conservative Association’s proposed Clayton ward appeared to cut through the Clayton Green community.

38 We therefore developed an alternative proposal for the northern parishes that we considered would better reflect our statutory criteria. Our proposal is based on a local resident’s submission, who stated that the A6 road could represent a strong boundary through Clayton-le-Woods parish. By using the A6 as a ward boundary from the south of the parish up to the B5256, we are able to create a Clayton East, Brindle & Hoghton ward and a Clayton West & Cuerden ward which follow relatively clear boundaries and provide for reasonably good electoral equality.

39 We consider our recommendations will ensure that communities in the east of Clayton-le-Woods parish will have clear road links with the parishes of Brindle and Hoghton via Sandy Lane and Westwood Road. In addition, we are of the view that these wards do not visibly split communities – for instance, our proposed Clayton East, Brindle & Hoghton ward does not split the Clayton Brook community. Nonetheless, given that we have developed our own warding proposals for this area, we would particularly welcome comments on these wards during this period of consultation.
Eastern Chorley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward Name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adlington &amp; Anderton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adlington & Anderton
40 We received submissions from Anderton Parish Council and three local residents suggesting that Heath Charnock parish should be placed in a ward with the parishes of Adlington and Anderton, stating that these communities share a number of facilities and often co-operate on local matters.

41 However, we are unable to adopt this proposal as part of our draft recommendations. While we note the proximity and community ties between the three parishes, placing Heath Charnock parish in a ward with Adlington and Anderton would result in an unacceptably high electoral variance of 22% for Adlington & Anderton ward. This variance is well beyond the electoral variances we would normally accept.

42 We have thus based our draft recommendations for Adlington & Anderton ward on the proposed boundaries put forward by the Council and the Conservative Association. This ward brings together the larger parishes of Adlington and Anderton with the smaller parish of Rivington.

Chorley East
43 Our draft recommendations for Chorley East ward are largely based on the proposals of the Council, subject to ward boundary changes in the north of the ward. Instead of following the polling district boundary across Stump Lane, and to the rear of properties on Kershaw Street, Cobden Street and Foster Street, we propose to run the ward boundary along the railway line and Corporation Street in order to create a more identifiable boundary. We considered that the Conservative Association’s proposal to incorporate the whole of polling district 06B into a Chorley East ward would not provide for a cohesive ward with strong, identifiable boundaries.

44 Our proposed ward broadly follows the existing Chorley East ward, keeping together the polling districts of 05A, 05B and 05C. However, the proposed ward will also incorporate the rural areas of Heath Charnock and Anglezarke, both of which have good road access to the urban part of the ward via Cowling Road, Back Lane and Long Lane. Our Chorley East ward will have an electoral variance of 9% by 2024.

Chorley North East
45 Our draft recommendations for Chorley North East ward are based on the proposals of the Council, apart from a significant amendment to the boundary in the west of the ward. We have decided to place the existing East parish ward of Whittle-le-Woods in this ward, rather than in Chorley North, in order to create a more cohesive warding pattern in this part of the borough. Consequently, we have moved the polling district of 06C from Chorley North East ward to Chorley North ward to achieve good electoral equality. We also consider this warding pattern to better reflect road access routes in the area, where Whittle-le-Woods parish has strong links all the way up to Withnell parish via the A674 and B6229.

46 We were not persuaded by the Conservative Association’s proposed Pennine and Chorley Rural East wards for this area, as we considered the splitting of Wheelton parish between the two wards would not reflect community identities and interests effectively.
47 Wheelton Parish Council expressed a desire for the parish to be aligned in a ward with Heapey parish. We have adopted this suggestion, as we are persuaded by the argument that the two share similar characteristics, both being rural parishes.

48 Two submissions made reference to the existing boundary between Pennine and Wheelton & Withnell wards which cuts through Wheelton village. One submission proposed an alternative boundary just south of Wheelton village. However, adopting this proposal would result in a Chorley North East ward with a poor electoral variance. We have thus decided that the boundary should follow the East parish ward of Whittle-le-Woods parish in order to achieve good electoral equality.

49 We have also adopted a local resident’s request to keep Abbey village and Withnell village in the same ward. Our Chorley North East ward will have an electoral variance of -10% by 2024.
### Chorley town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chorley North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley North West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley South East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorley South West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chorley North
50 Given our decision not to place Astley Village and Buckshaw in the same ward, we have adopted the Council’s proposal to place the parish in a ward with the centre of Chorley town. This is consistent with the submissions made by Astley Village Parish Council and two local residents, who provided strong evidence that the village should look towards the town, rather than Buckshaw village.

51 We have, however, significantly amended the remainder of the proposed Chorley North ward. In the west of the proposed ward, we have followed the Astley Village and Euxton parish boundary, in order to remove what was effectively a ‘bottle neck’ between north-west Euxton and south-east Euxton. We have also made this change to avoid the creation of a small parish ward for the highly populated Euxton parish. Furthermore, in the north, we have transferred Whittle-le-Woods East parish ward from the Council’s proposed Chorley North ward to Chorley North East.

52 We have made these changes because we considered that the Council’s proposed Chorley North ward did not follow sufficiently clear boundaries and contained relatively disparate areas with little sense of shared community identity. This was borne out when on our visit to Chorley when we looked at the proposed ward boundaries on the ground. For similar reasons, we were not persuaded by the Conservative Association’s proposals for the north of Chorley town, which separated the area into three separate wards. Our Chorley North ward will have an electoral variance of -3% by 2024.

Chorley North West
53 We have broadly based our draft recommendations on the Council’s proposed ward which was similar to the existing ward in this area. We agree in particular with the Council’s proposal to incorporate the 09E polling district in this ward, using Tootell Street as a strong, recognisable boundary.

54 However, we made some modifications to this ward in order to create more identifiable boundaries. We have followed the railway line, rather than Market Street, in the east of the ward, as we considered it to be a better boundary between the western and eastern parts of town. We have also decided to follow Pall Mall in its entirety, as we again consider that this boundary will be more identifiable than the one proposed by the Council, which would have taken in electors that live on Duke Street, Shaw Hill Street, Silvester Road and Brindle Street and its connected roads. Our ward will have good electoral equality in 2024.

Chorley South East
55 We have based our draft recommendations for Chorley South East ward on the Council’s proposals apart from a minor change to the northern boundary where we propose that it follows Pall Mall, which we consider to be a stronger boundary. Under our draft recommendations, this ward will have good electoral equality in 2024 and will, in our view, reflect community identities.

Chorley South West
56 We have based our draft recommendations for Chorley South West ward on the Council’s proposals. However, we have made minor boundary changes in the east of the ward, where we propose that it also includes electors on the western side...
of Tootell Street, Weldbank Lane and Mountbatten Road and its connected roads. We consider our proposed ward will follow more identifiable boundaries and will ensure good electoral equality – especially given our changes to the west of the ward, which we have made to ensure that Charnock Richard is not split between wards. Our proposed Chorley South West ward will have an electoral variance of -8% by 2024.
# Western Chorley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of Cllrs</th>
<th>Variance 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coppull</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croston &amp; Mawdesley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccleston, Charnock Richard &amp; Euxton South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euxton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A
Coppull
57 We have based our draft recommendations for Coppull ward on the proposals from the Council and the Conservative Association, which place the parish in one ward. This proposal was supported by three local residents. Our proposed Coppull ward will have good electoral equality in 2024 and reflects community identities, based on the evidence received.

Croston & Mawdesley and Eccleston, Charnock Richard & Euxton South
58 We received two warding proposals for the rural western parishes from the Council and the Conservative Association. The Council placed the parish of Eccleston in a ward with Heskin parish and a majority of Charnock Richard parish. It proposed that the south of Euxton parish be placed in a ward with the parishes of Bretherton, Croston, Mawdesley and Ulnes Walton. Alternatively, the Conservative Association placed Heskin in a ward with Bretherton, Croston, Mawdesley and Ulnes Walton and placed the south of Euxton parish in a ward with the parishes of Eccleston and Charnock Richard.

59 We carefully examined the two alternative warding patterns for this area and have decided to base our recommendations on the Conservative Association’s proposals. We consider that the Conservative’s proposals better reflect our statutory criteria than the Council’s. In particular, we consider that they better reflect local transport routes between communities and, overall, provide for more clearly identifiable ward boundaries. We also considered that the link between the parish of Mawdesley and south Euxton was not strong, and that the proposed division of Charnock Richard parish between wards would split a cohesive community into two.

60 However, we do note the submissions made by Eccleston Parish Council and a local resident who both suggested that Heskin parish should be placed in a ward with Eccleston parish, due to their proximity and community ties. For this reason, we are particularly interested to hear local views in relation to our proposed wards during consultation.

61 Bretherton Parish Council requested that it be placed in a ward with Croston parish and Ulnes Walton parish due to the rural nature of these communities. We agree that placing these parishes together will effectively reflect community identities and have adopted this proposal as part of our draft recommendations.

62 We are also recommending different ward names to those proposed by the Council and Conservative Association. We have decided that the proposed Lostock & Mawdesley ward, as proposed by the Council, be named Croston & Mawdesley as we consider the village of Croston to be a more defining feature of the ward than the River Lostock, given approximately 40% of the ward’s electorate live in Croston parish. We have also adopted the name Eccleston, Charnock Richard & Euxton South for the other western rural ward. We consider our proposed ward name is more descriptive of the communities which comprise it than the Conservative Association’s proposed name of Chorley West.

Euxton
63 The Council and the Conservative Association proposed a broadly similar warding arrangement for Euxton. Both proposed a ward which contained the existing
Euxton North ward and the eastern part of the current Euxton South ward, thus placing the south-western part of the parish into rural wards to the west to provide for electoral equality.

64 Both Euxton Parish Council and two local residents stated a preference for Euxton parish remaining wholly in one borough ward but recognised that the parish had an electorate that was both too large for a single ward and too small to divide into two wards. Consequently, the three submissions generally accepted the likelihood of the parish being split as part of draft recommendations to satisfy our statutory criteria. Two of the submissions did, however, request that any ward which had parts of Euxton parish within it should consequently include the Euxton name, given the parish has a strong community identity.

65 We have decided to adopt the Conservative Association’s proposal for Euxton parish. We consider that this proposal, which joins southern Euxton with Eccleston and Charnock Richard, will form a more cohesive ward than the Council’s proposal, which divided the south-west of Euxton into two wards rather than one. We have also amended the eastern boundary of our Euxton ward to follow the parish boundary, as discussed in paragraph 51.

66 As stated in paragraph 62, we have decided that the borough ward that contains south Euxton should be named Eccleston, Charnock Richard & Euxton South. This is to represent the Euxton community that will now be placed within this ward. However, we did not consider that the ward which contains the Buckshaw village part of the parish should contain the Euxton name as we consider Buckshaw village to have a distinct identity which is separate from the rest of Euxton parish.

67 The two borough-wide schemes differed in relation to electors that reside on Firbank, Brookside and Park Avenue. We have placed electors on these roads in our proposed Eccleston, Charnock Richard & Euxton South ward to best reflect the local road layout and access routes.
Conclusions

The table below shows the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality, based on 2018 and 2024 electorate figures.

Summary of electoral arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft recommendations</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of electoral wards</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>2,038</td>
<td>2,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parish electoral arrangements

As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.
70 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Chorley Borough Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

71 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 Clayton-le-Woods Parish Council, Euxton Parish Council and Heath Charnock Parish Council.

72 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Clayton-le-Woods parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Brook</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton Green</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Euxton parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buckshaw Village</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North &amp; East</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Heath Charnock parish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish ward</th>
<th>Number of parish councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Have your say

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

76 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don’t think our recommendations are right for Chorley, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

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

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

       Review Officer (Chorley)
       The Local Government Boundary Commission for England
       1st Floor, Windsor House
       50 Victoria Street
       London
       SW1H 0TL

79 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for the Chorley 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

80 A good pattern of wards 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

81 Electoral equality:

   • Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of voters as elsewhere in the council area?
82 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?

83 Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

84 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 in Victoria Street (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.

85 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.

86 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.

87 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 all-out elections for Chorley in 2020.

**Equalities**

88 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.
## Appendix A

### Draft recommendations for Chorley Borough Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward name</th>
<th>Number of councillors</th>
<th>Electorate (2018)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
<th>Electorate (2024)</th>
<th>Number of electors per councillor</th>
<th>Variance from average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Adlington &amp; Anderton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>6,251</td>
<td>2,084</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Buckshaw &amp; Whittle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,248</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chorley East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,676</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7,009</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Chorley North</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,109</td>
<td>2,036</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Chorley North East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,507</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>5,772</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Chorley North West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,751</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Chorley South East</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,283</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6,461</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Chorley South West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>5,916</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Clayton East, Brindle &amp; Hoghton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,913</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Clayton West &amp; Cuerden</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,250</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6,865</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Coppull</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6,572</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward name</td>
<td>Number of councillors</td>
<td>Electorate (2018)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
<td>Electorate (2024)</td>
<td>Number of electors per councillor</td>
<td>Variance from average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Croston &amp; Mawdesley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,694</td>
<td>1,898</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Eccleston, Charnock Richard &amp; Euxton South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Euxton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,814</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>6,169</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>42</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,575</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>90,148</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Averages</strong></td>
<td><strong>–</strong></td>
<td><strong>–</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,038</strong></td>
<td><strong>–</strong></td>
<td><strong>–</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>–</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Outline map

A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-west/lancashire/chorley
Appendix C

Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at: www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/north-west/lancashire/chorley

Local Authority

- Chorley Borough Council

Political Group

- Chorley Conservative Association

Parish and Town Councils

- Anderton Parish Council
- Astley Village Parish Council
- Bretherton Parish Council
- Eccleston Parish Council
- Euxton Parish Council
- Wheelton Parish Council

Local Residents

- 37 local residents
# Appendix D

## Glossary and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Council size</strong></th>
<th>The number of councillors elected to serve on a council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral Change Order (or Order)</strong></td>
<td>A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral fairness</strong></td>
<td>When one elector’s vote is worth the same as another’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electoral inequality</strong></td>
<td>Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of electors per councillor</strong></td>
<td>The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish council</strong></td>
<td>A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also ‘Town council’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish (or Town) council electoral arrangements</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parish ward</strong></td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town council</strong></td>
<td>A parish council which has been given ceremonial ‘town’ status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under-represented</strong></td>
<td>Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance (or electoral variance)</strong></td>
<td>How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.

Local Government Boundary Commission for England
1st Floor, Windsor House
50 Victoria Street, London
SW1H 0TL

Telephone: 0330 500 1525
Email: reviews@lgbce.org.uk
Online: www.lgbce.org.uk or www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk
Twitter: @LGBCE