**Local Government Boundary Commission for England – Review of Electoral Divisions in Lancashire: Political Governance Working Group recommendations to Full Council**

**Burnley**

There are six divisions and this will stay the same. Of the six Burnley North East is projected to be -10% by 2021. This division borders Burnley Central East which, if unchanged, is projected to be +4%.

**Key points**: The working group recommended the Labour Group option.

In this option, one polling district (named ED) is moved into Burnley North East from Burnley Central East. This polling district is one of four in Bank Hall ward. The move results in two polling districts from the ward being in each of these two divisions. The remaining fourdivisions would be unchanged.

**Burnley Working Group proposal - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Burnley Central East | 1 | 11,073 | -0.1% |
| Burnley Central West | 1 | 10,773 | -2.8% |
| Burnley North East | 1 | 10,435 | -5.8% |
| Burnley Rural | 1 | 11,278 | 1.8% |
| Burnley South West | 1 | 11,327 | 2.2% |
| Padiham and Burnley West | 1 | 10,535 | -4.9% |

**Chorley**

There are currently 7 divisions in Chorley. Recent population growth has seen the district electorate increase significantly, making it imperative that the number of divisions increases to 8.

Of the existing seven, three are projected to be much too big by 2021. These are Chorley North (projected to be +37%), Chorley West (+20%) and Chorley Rural East (+19%). Others are above the average size but within the 10% parameters but Chorley East is projected to be -8%.

**Key points**: The Group recommended the two proposals presented by Chorley Borough Council. These options have all party agreement in Chorley. Narrative from Chorley Borough Council supporting their formal proposals is attached at Annex 1.

Both proposals do contain one division that is just outside the 10% parameter (-10.4%).

**Chorley Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Chorley Central | 1 | 10,299 | -7.1% |
| Chorley North | 1 | 10,198 | -8.0% |
| Chorley Rural East | 1 | 9,928 | -10.4% |
| Chorley Rural West | 1 | 11,805 | 6.5% |
| Chorley South | 1 | 11,375 | 2.6% |
| Clayton with Whittle | 1 | 10,859 | -2.0% |
| Euxton with Buckshaw | 1 | 11,781 | 6.3% |
| Hoghton with Wheelton | 1 | 10,242 | -7.6% |

**Chorley Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Chorley East | 1 | 10,198 | -8.0% |
| Chorley North | 1 | 10,859 | -2.0% |
| Chorley North West | 1 | 11,781 | 6.3% |
| Chorley Rural East | 1 | 9,928 | -10.4% |
| Chorley Rural North | 1 | 10,242 | -7.6% |
| Chorley Rural West | 1 | 10,766 | -2.9% |
| Chorley South | 1 | 10,737 | -3.1% |
| Chorley West | 1 | 11,976 | 8.1% |

**Fylde**

There are six divisions and this will remain the same. Of the six, Fylde South is projected to be -11% by 2021 and Fylde East is projected to be +10%. These two divisions border each other.

**Key points**: The group recommended the status quo option as proposed by the Independent Group (proposal 1) with a second preference for officer option A (proposal 2).

Although it results in one division being just outside the 10% parameter, the status quo option is preferred. This is because the officer alternative involves splitting Newton with Clifton parish, which has a strong community identify and the two parts of the parish share key community resources, including a primary school and village hall.

**Fylde Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Fylde East | 1 | 12,185 | 9.9% |
| Fylde South | 1 | 9,900 | -10.7% |
| Fylde West | 1 | 11,682 | 5.4% |
| Lytham | 1 | 11,007 | -0.7% |
| St Annes North | 1 | 11,314 | 2.1% |
| St Annes South | 1 | 11,872 | 7.1% |

**Fylde Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Fylde East | 1 | 11,314 | 2.1% |
| Fylde South | 1 | 10,771 | -2.8% |
| Fylde West | 1 | 11,682 | 5.4% |
| Lytham | 1 | 11,007 | -0.7% |
| St Annes North | 1 | 11,314 | 2.1% |
| St Annes South | 1 | 11,872 | 7.1% |

**Hyndburn**

There are six divisions in Hyndburn and this will stay the same. Of the existing six, Great Harwood is projected to be -24% by 2021. As it is in the north of the district, the only division with which it shares a border is Rishton and Clayton-le-Moors. Accrington South is also projected to be -12%.

**Key points**: The group recommended the Labour Group option.

In this proposal a two member division is proposed to cover Great Harwood, Rishton, Clayton-le-Moors and Altham. The proposed division covers all of the existing Great Harwood and Rishton and Clayton-le-Moors divisions and also Altham parish from Accrington North. What remains of Accrington North gains another polling district that is in Church ward (HC). It also gains polling district BA from, and loses polling district AC to, Accrington South.

The main area of the existing Accrington West is renamed Accrington West and Oswaldtwistle Central. At the western border of this division, where it meets the Oswaldtwistle division border, two areas are swapped between the divisions (polling districts IA and JA).

**Hyndburn Working Group proposal – divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Accrington North | 1 | 10,012 | -9.7% |
| Accrington South | 1 | 10,206 | -7.9% |
| Accrington West and Oswaldtwistle Central | 1 | 10,564 | -4.7% |
| Oswaldtwistle | 1 | 10,103 | -8.8% |
| Great Harwood, Rishton, Clayton-le-Moors and Altham | 2 | 20,312 | -8.4% |

**Lancaster**

Of the ten divisions, just one (Lancaster Rural East) is projected to be above the 10% parameter (+15%) by 2021. Three are projected to be too small. These are Lancaster South East (-29%) and Morecambe North and Skerton (each -11%). Lancaster Central is projected to be +9%.

Lancaster City has undergone a recent review of wards, which came into effect in 2015. This was an extra element to consider when reviewing the electoral divisions.

**Key points**: The group recommended the Labour Group option.

In this proposal Lancaster Rural East is reduced at its north western border, as Lancaster Rural North expands eastwards. The latter loses part of Bolton le Sands parish (polling district BOSA) to Morecambe North division. Where the three Morecambe divisions intersect there are several other changes between their borders.

The existing narrow Lancaster South East expands both eastwards (into Lancaster Central) and westwards (into Lancaster Rural East).

See table overleaf.

**Lancaster Working Group proposal - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Heysham | 1 | 11,243 | 1.5% |
| Lancaster Central | 1 | 10,117 | -8.7% |
| Lancaster East | 1 | 10,649 | -3.9% |
| Lancaster Rural East | 1 | 10,183 | -8.1% |
| Lancaster Rural North | 1 | 10,103 | -8.8% |
| Lancaster South East | 1 | 10,902 | -1.6% |
| Morecambe North | 1 | 10,560 | -4.7% |
| Morecambe South | 1 | 11,255 | 1.6% |
| Morecambe West | 1 | 11,483 | 3.6% |
| Skerton | 1 | 10,472 | -5.5% |

**Pendle**

Pendle has six divisions and that number will remain the same. Of the six, West Craven is projected to be much too big by 2021 (+25%). Given its geographic position in the north of the district it only shares a border with the existing Pendle East division.

**Key points**: The group recommended the joint Labour and Liberal Democrat groups' proposal.

In this proposal the existing West Craven loses an area at its southern end. This moves to the adjacent Pendle East. As a result of this gain Pendle East has to be reduced elsewhere, hence polling district BI from its central western border joins Pendle Central. The proposal also includes the renaming of West Craven as Barnoldswick and Earby division. Following the proposed changes the division still remains above the 10% parameter, at +11.7%. However this is the best option in terms of maintaining community identity in the locality.

**Pendle Working Group proposal - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Brierfield and Nelson North | 1 | 11,367 | 2.6% |
| Nelson South | 1 | 10,662 | -3.8% |
| Pendle Central | 1 | 11,641 | 5.0% |
| Pendle East | 1 | 12,163 | 9.7% |
| Pendle West | 1 | 11,541 | 4.1% |
| Barnoldswick and Earby | 1 | 12,380 | 11.7% |

**Preston**

Preston currently has 10 divisions. With a projected 2021 electorate of 102,087 better electoral equality is achieved by moving to 9 divisions (+2.4% from the county average).

Of the existing ten divisions, four are projected to be outside of the 10% parameter by 2021. These are Preston South East (-21%), Preston North West (-17%), Preston North (-16%) and Preston City (-11%).

**Key points**: The group recommended the Labour Group proposal (proposal 1) with a second preference for officer option C (proposal 2).

In the Working Group proposal 1 Preston West loses a polling district from its southern end (part of Lea ward) but expands further west (into Greyfriars and Cadley wards). These are areas of Preston North, the remainder of which is distributed between three other adjacent divisions. One of these is the existing Preston North East, which now takes on the name of Preston North. Preston East expands to cover two polling districts in this area (G and GA – part of Garrison ward). Preston East is reduced from the south (part of Ribbleton ward). That area joins Preston South East to enlarge it.

As part of the proposal several amended divisions change name. Preston North West becomes Preston South West; Preston North East becomes Preston North and Preston Central South and Central North are renamed Central West and Central East respectively.

**Preston Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Preston Central East | 1 | 11,056 | -0.2% |
| Preston Central West | 1 | 11,134 | 0.5% |
| Preston City | 1 | 11,012 | -0.6% |
| Preston East | 1 | 11,228 | 1.3% |
| Preston North | 1 | 11,117 | 0.3% |
| Preston Rural | 1 | 12,058 | 8.8% |
| Preston South East | 1 | 11,668 | 5.3% |
| Preston South West | 1 | 11,737 | 5.9% |
| Preston West | 1 | 11,076 | -0.1% |

In the Working Group proposal 2 Preston West loses a polling district from its southern end (part of Lea ward) but expands further west (into Greyfriars and Cadley wards). These are areas of Preston North which in turn expands eastwards, into Preston North East. From the other direction, Preston East expands into most of what remains of the existing Preston North East, but loses an area from the south (part of Ribbleton ward). That area goes into Preston South East. Other divisions expand to gain one or two polling districts.

As part of the proposal several amended divisions change name. Preston North West becomes Preston South West and Preston Central South and Central North are renamed Central West and Central East respectively.

**Preston Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Preston Central East | 1 | 11,541 | 4.1% |
| Preston Central West | 1 | 11,134 | 0.5% |
| Preston City | 1 | 11,012 | -0.6% |
| Preston East | 1 | 11,700 | 5.6% |
| Preston North | 1 | 11,542 | 4.1% |
| Preston Rural | 1 | 10,678 | -3.7% |
| Preston South East | 1 | 11,668 | 5.3% |
| Preston South West | 1 | 11,737 | 5.9% |
| Preston West | 1 | 11,076 | -0.1% |

**Ribble Valley**

There are four divisions in the district. All are projected to be over the county average electorate. Two are outside of the 10% parameter - Ribble Valley North East is projected to be +17% and Clitheroe +13% by 2021.

The existing Clitheroe division is also a "doughnut" shape which is not generally acceptable to the Boundary Commission. Therefore, this needs to be considered.

**Key points:** The group recommended officer option A (proposal 1) with a second preference for the Conservative Group 4 member 3 division option (proposal 2).

In the Working Group proposal 1 the main changes are to the intersecting divisional borders to the west of Clitheroe division. There are also changes further north, involving Gisburn Forest, Bolton by Bowland and Grindleton parishes. The changes impact upon Longridge with Bowland, Ribble Valley North East and Ribble Valley South West. Although Clitheroe division itself is not amended the changes around it mean it is no longer a doughnut shape.

Clitheroe division is a complete Town Council area and it is not possible to reduce it in any logical way and maintain the town council area. However leaving it unchanged means it is over the 10% parameter (+13.1%) but better reflects community identity.

**Ribble Valley Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Clitheroe | 1 | 12,531 | 13.1% |
| Longridge with Bowland | 1 | 11,773 | 6.2% |
| Ribble Valley North East | 1 | 11,994 | 8.2% |
| Ribble Valley South West | 1 | 11,999 | 8.3% |

In the Working Group proposal 2 there are changes around the intersecting divisional borders to the west of Clitheroe division and to Gisburn Forest parish. A two member division is proposed for Ribble Valley North East and Clitheroe.

**Ribble Valley Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Ribble Valley North East and Clitheroe | 2 | 24,171 | 9.0% |
| Longridge with Bowland | 1 | 12,127 | 9.4% |
| Ribble Valley South West | 1 | 11,999 | 8.3% |

**Rossendale**

There are five divisions in Rossendale. This will remain the same. Rossendale West is projected to be -14% by 2021. Conversely, Rossendale East and South are projected to be +11% and +10%.

The imbalance is mostly between Rossendale West and Rossendale East, but they are on opposite sides of the district and do not share a common border. Rossendale North and Rossendale South separate these two divisions.

**Key points:** The group recommended the officer option (proposal 1), the Labour Group option (proposal 2) and the Conservative Group option (proposal 3) for consideration.

In proposal 1 Rossendale West is extended**,** at its south eastern border, into an area of the existing Rossendale South (polling district HE1). The eastern border of Rossendale South is extended eastwards into an area of Rossendale East (polling district RW1), which is consequently reduced in size.

**Rossendale Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Rossendale East | 1 | 11,005 | -0.7% |
| Rossendale North | 1 | 10,941 | -1.3% |
| Rossendale South | 1 | 11,769 | 6.2% |
| Rossendale West | 1 | 11,295 | 1.9% |
| Whitworth | 1 | 10,757 | -2.9% |

In proposal 2 Rossendale West is extended at its eastern border (in the centre) into an area of the existing Rossendale South (polling district HG2). Rossendale East is reduced as polling district RW1 moves to Rossendale North – which is renamed Mid Rossendale.

**Rossendale Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Rossendale East | 1 | 11,005 | -0.7% |
| Mid Rossendale | 1 | 12,235 | 10.4% |
| Rossendale South | 1 | 10,280 | -7.2% |
| Rossendale West | 1 | 11,490 | 3.7% |
| Whitworth | 1 | 10,757 | -2.9% |

In proposal 3 Rossendale West is extended at its eastern border (in the centre) into an area of the existing Rossendale South (polling district HG1). Rossendale East is reduced as polling district BG3 moves to Whitworth. The latter is renamed Whitworth and Bacup.

**Rossendale Working Group proposal 3 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Rossendale East | 1 | 11,463 | 3.4% |
| Rossendale North | 1 | 10,941 | -1.3% |
| Rossendale South | 1 | 11,338 | 2.3% |
| Rossendale West | 1 | 10,432 | -5.9% |
| Whitworth and Bacup | 1 | 11,593 | 4.6% |

**South Ribble**

There are eight divisions in the district and this will remain the same. The existing divisional pattern presents a mixed scenario. Leyland Central is projected to be +28% by 2021, Penwortham South to be +21% and Leyland South West to be +13%. South Ribble Rural West is projected to be +10.5%. Conversely, Penwortham North is projected to be too small (-15%).

There has also been a review of ward boundaries in the district. These have been considered when making proposals for amendments to existing divisions.

**Key points:** The group recommended the officer option A (proposal 1) with a second preference for the Labour Group alternative proposal of a 3 member division (proposal 2).

In the working group proposal 1 there are proposes changes to borders of all existing divisions but particularly around the intersecting borders of the existing Penwortham South, Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale and South Ribble Rural East divisions. And also, further south, to the borders of Farington and the two Leyland divisions. The option includes renaming of four proposed divisions to reflect the geographic areas covered.

**South Ribble Working Group proposal 1 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Bamber Bridge | 1 | 11,807 | 6.5% |
| Leyland Central with Farington | 1 | 11,846 | 6.9% |
| Leyland South | 1 | 11,577 | 4.5% |
| Leyland West | 1 | 11,483 | 3.6% |
| Penwortham West | 1 | 11,761 | 6.1% |
| Walton-le-Dale and Penwortham East | 1 | 11,586 | 4.5% |
| South Ribble Rural East | 1 | 11,667 | 5.3% |
| South Ribble Rural West | 1 | 11,183 | 0.9% |

In the working group proposal 2 the proposed changes to divisional boundaries are the same as in proposal 1. However a 3 member division, to be called Leyland and Farington, is proposed from the areas covered by the three separate divisions of Farington and Golden Hill, Leyland Central and Leyland South West in proposal 1.

**South Ribble Working Group proposal 2 - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Bamber Bridge | 1 | 11,807 | 6.5% |
| Leyland and Farington | 3 | 34,906 | 5.0% |
| Penwortham West | 1 | 11,761 | 6.1% |
| Walton-le-Dale and Penwortham East | 1 | 11,586 | 4.5% |
| South Ribble Rural East | 1 | 11,667 | 5.3% |
| South Ribble Rural West | 1 | 11,183 | 0.9% |

**West Lancashire**

Of the eight divisions two are projected to be too small (Ormskirk West -17% and West Lancashire East -12%). West Lancashire West is projected to be too big (+12%).

**Key points:** The group recommended the Labour Group proposal.

In this proposal West Lancashire West is renamed Burscough and Rufford, as it is reduced, at its south western border, with three polling districts (SBB, SBC & SBD, all of which are parts of Scarisbrick parish and Scarisbrick ward) moving to West Lancashire South. West Lancashire South now takes the name of West Lancashire West, as that now better reflects its geographic area, as it is reduced from its south eastern area (Bickerstaffe ward and part of Aughton Park ward). West Lancashire East extends to cover the Bickerstaffe ward and part of Aughton Park ward and also reduces at its north western border, as polling district DEB (part of Derby ward) joins Ormskirk West in order to increase it.

See table overleaf.

**West Lancashire Working Group proposal - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Ormskirk West | 1 | 11,000 | -1% |
| Skelmersdale Central | 1 | 11,105 | 0.2% |
| Skelmersdale East | 1 | 11,143 | 0.5% |
| Skelmersdale West | 1 | 11,044 | -0.4% |
| West Lancashire East | 1 | 10,748 | -3% |
| West Lancashire North | 1 | 11,588 | 5% |
| Burscough and Rufford | 1 | 10,397 | -6% |
| West Lancashire West | 1 | 10,615 | -4% |

**Wyre**

There are eight divisions in Wyre and this will remain the same. The current divisions present a mixed scenario. The two sides of Wyre, if considered as separate entities, present a stark imbalance in electorate. The average variance for the west bank is -9.2% and on the east bank it is +17.8%.The only divisions on the west bank with positive variances are Poulton-le-Fylde (+2.6%) and Thornton Cleveleys Central (+0.9%). All the others on the west side have high negative variances. As a result of this imbalance, the only way to achieve divisions with variances within the 10% parameter is to propose one that crosses the river Wyre.

**Key points:** The group recommended the Labour Group proposal, which incorporates proposals from the Independent Group.

In this proposal, in the west of the district, the division of Thornton and Hambleton covers the western part of the existing Wyreside division and some of the existing Amounderness division. It is split across both sides of the river Wyre. The remaining part of the existing Amounderness division becomes the newly named Cleveleys South and Carleton division. The newly proposed division stretches northwards to cover some of the lower parts of the existing Thornton Cleveleys Central. The existing Thornton Cleveleys North, with some small amendments, is re-named as Cleveleys East.

A Fleetwood West and Cleveleys West division is formed from the remaining parts of the existing Thornton Cleveleys Central, the central area of the existing Fleetwood West and an extension eastwards into Fleetwood East (Park ward). In return Fleetwood East expands as its north-western border to cover Warren ward and part of Mount ward.

In the east of the district, the proposed Wyre Rural Central covers the remaining part (the east) of the existing Wyreside division. It also covers three polling districts that are part of the existing Garstang division (WZB, WUC1 and WSC). What remains of Garstang is renamed Wyre Rural East.

**Wyre Working Group proposal - divisions by 2021**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Division name** | **Number of cllrs per division** | **Electorate June 2021** | **Variance**  **2021** |
| Cleveleys East | 1 | 10,198 | -8.0% |
| Cleveleys South and Carleton | 1 | 11,685 | 5.4% |
| Fleetwood East | 1 | 10,698 | -3.5% |
| Fleetwood West and Cleveleys West | 1 | 11,513 | 3.9% |
| Poulton-le-Fylde | 1 | 11,339 | 2.3% |
| Thornton and Hambleton | 1 | 10,621 | -4.2% |
| Wyre Rural Central | 1 | 10,257 | -7.5% |
| Wyre Rural East | 1 | 10,179 | -8.2% |