

SOUTH RIBBLE BOROUGH COUNCIL
COUNCIL MEETING – 20 NOVEMBER 2013
REPORT OF THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE

The Boundary Committee met on the afternoons of Tuesday 22nd October and 4th November 2013.

The Committee considered each of the five My Neighbourhood areas in turn to see where members of the Committee could reach a consensus on both the proposals for the boundaries and for the proposed ward names.

1. Electoral Review Of Western Parishes.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Western Parishes.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commission's proposals for Western Parishes which were substantially in line with the Council's submission with the exception of the area around Ratten Lane, Hutton. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Commission's proposals were not as electorally balanced as the Council's submission the rationale behind the proposal was understood and it was therefore proposed that the Commission's proposals be accepted.

All members of the Committee agreed

That the Boundary Commissions proposals in respect of Western Parishes be accepted.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Ward names in Western Parishes

The Chairman sought the Committee's views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Western Parishes area and with the exception of the proposed name of Hoole for Much Hoole and Little Hoole the names were agreed.

In view of the fact that the ward has been known for some time as Little Hoole and Much Hoole and comprised the two separate parishes of Little Hoole and Much Hoole the ward should retain its name of Little Hoole and Much Hoole.

All members of the Committee agreed

That the Boundary Commissions proposed names in respect of Longton and Hutton West and New Longton and Hutton East be agreed, but that Hoole be named Little Hoole and Much Hoole.

2. Electoral Review Of Central.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Central.

The Chairman referred to Boundary Commissions proposals for Central and sought the views of the Committee.

Concern was expressed at the Commission's proposals for the north part of Lostock Hall which did not address the issues identified in the Council's submission. This concerned the area around Eagleton Way and Condor Way which was only accessed off The Cawsey and had no direct link with Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate. Once The Cawsey was completed it would provide a link through to Walton-le-Dale West.

Concern was also expressed that the area around Todd Lane North had been included in Walton-le-Dale West but that in reality they were part of the Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate community and it was therefore proposed that the Commission be recommended to change these boundaries to reflect these concerns.

All members of the Committee present agreed.

That the Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of Farington East and Farington West be accepted, subject to the comments outlined within Leyland (minute 29). However, in respect of the Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate Ward, the Commission be requested to amend the northern boundary to address the issues highlighted above.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Ward names in Central.

The Chairman sought the Committee's views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Central area and it was suggested that Lostock Hall should be named Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate to reflect the two communities.

All members of the Committee present agreed

That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Farington East and West be accepted but that the Lostock Hall Ward be named Lostock Hall and Tardy Gate.

3. Electoral Review Of Penwortham.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Penwortham.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commission's proposals for Penwortham and sought the views of the Committee.

Generally the Committee accepted the proposals put forward by the Commission however some members expressed concern that the Council's proposals for a single member ward for Kingsfold had not been accepted bearing in mind the distinct separate communities that Kingsfold and Middleforth represented.

However, other members supported the Commission's proposals for a three member Middleforth ward.

All members of the Committee present agreed

That the Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of the wards in Penwortham with the exception of Middleforth be accepted.

The majority of members agreed.

That the Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of Middleforth be rejected and the Commission be recommended to split Middleforth into a 1 member (Kingsfold) ward and a 2 member (Middleforth) ward in accordance with the Council's original submission.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Ward names in Penwortham

The Chairman sought the Committee's views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Penwortham area.

Members expressed the general acceptance of the proposed names however there was a suggestion that the ward names be Penwortham North, East, South and West. However the possibility of confusion with County Divisions was expressed against this suggestion.

All members of the Committee present agreed

That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Penwortham be accepted.

The majority of members agreed.

That in the event that the Commission accept the splitting of Middleforth the Boundary Commission be recommended to name the split Middleforth ward, Kingsfold and Middleforth.

4. Electoral Review Of Eastern.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Eastern.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commission's proposals for Eastern and it was brought to the attention of the Committee that there was an error in the Commission's figure for the Coupe Green and Gregson Lane ward where a large number of existing properties and new development had been omitted. This effectively meant that the Council's original submissions for Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West provided better electoral equality and which was very close to that submitted by the Labour group.

In view of the proposed change to Walton-le-Dale West referred to in Minute 26 above it would be necessary to look in more detail at the boundary between the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le Dale East.

All members of the Committee present agreed

1. That the Boundary Commission be informed that the Council believes its original submission for the Wards of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East and Bamber Bridge West provided better electoral equality and should be adopted.
2. That the Ward of Samlesbury and Walton be accepted
3. That members and officers agree a revised boundary of the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le-Dale East for submission to the Council meeting on 20 November 2013.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Ward names in Eastern.

The Chairman sought the Committee's views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Eastern area.

Members expressed their agreement to the proposed names of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West, Samlesbury and Walton and Walton-le-Dale West. However there was a disagreement on Walton-le-Dale East which some members thought should more correctly be named Bamber Bridge North as previously.

All Members of the Committee present agreed

That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Coupe Green and Gregson Lane, Bamber Bridge East, Bamber Bridge West, Samlesbury and Walton and Walton-le-Dale West be accepted.

The majority of members agreed.

That the Boundary Commission's proposed name in respect of Walton-le-Dale East be accepted.

5. Electoral Review Of Leyland.

a) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Wards in Leyland.

The Chairman referred to the Boundary Commission's proposals for Leyland and sought the views of the Committee.

The Committee noted the Commission's reluctance to accept the Council's submission for Buckshaw Village that it was a special case and would be best served as a single member ward. By merging Buckshaw with the Worden area the other wards proposed by the Commission were generally acceptable.

However, some Members considered that the Commission's proposals for the Earnshaw Bridge Ward was a somewhat odd shape and were two distinct communities and would be more suited to be split into two single member wards. The southern boundary between Earnshaw Bridge and the proposed Wade Hall Ward being adjusted slightly in the north and by following Leyland Lane to the borough boundary in the south.

Reference was also made to the northern boundary of the Leyland area and that of Farington East where the Council's submission and the Labour Group's submission were substantially the same but which the Commission had not accepted.

All members of the Committee present agreed

1. That the Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of the wards in Leyland with the exception of Earnshaw Bridge and its boundary with Wade Hall be accepted.
2. That members and officers agree a revised boundary of the proposed Farington East / Turpin Green for submission to the Council meeting on 20 November 2013.

The majority of members agreed.

That the Boundary Commission's proposals in respect of Earnshaw Bridge be rejected and the Commission be recommended to split Earnshaw Bridge into two 1 member wards adjusting the boundary as set out above.

b) To consider the draft Recommendations of The Local Government Boundary Commission for the Ward names in Leyland.

The Chairman sought the Committee's views on the proposed ward names for the wards in the Leyland area. There was a degree of discussion on the name for the various wards. Members were generally supportive of Broadfield and Buckshaw and Worden, but were concerned about some of the others. In particular Wade Hall which did not reflect the ward and which would be better named Seven Stars. Similarly Bannister Brook as the logical centre of Leyland would be better named Leyland Central and Moss Side would be more descriptively named Moss Side and Midge Hall.

Less agreement was reached on suggestions of St Ambrose for Turpin Green and Lostock for Earnshaw Bridge.

All members of the Committee present agreed

1. That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Broadfield and Buckshaw and Worden be accepted.
2. That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Moss Side, Wade Hall, and Bannister Brook be rejected and substituted by Moss Side and Midge Hall, Seven Stars and Leyland Central respectively.

The majority of members agreed

1. That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Earnshaw Bridge be accepted.
2. That in the event that the Commission accept the splitting of Earnshaw Bridge the Boundary Commission be recommended to name the split Earnshaw Bridge ward, Moss Side South East and Earnshaw Bridge
3. That the Boundary Commission's proposed names in respect of Turpin Green, be rejected and substituted by St Ambrose.

6. Forthcoming Meetings

Members agreed that there was no need for further meetings at this stage.

Members are asked to:

1. Approve the above recommendations of the Boundary Committee that all members of the Committee present agreed; and
2. Approve the above recommendations of the Boundary Committee that the majority of members of the Committee agreed; and
3. Agree any revised boundary of the proposed Walton-le-Dale West and Walton-le-Dale East wards; and
4. Agree any revised boundaries of the proposed Farington East / Turpin Green wards; and
5. Authorise the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chairman of the Boundary Committee to finalise the Council's response to the Local Government Boundary Commission's Draft Recommendations for New Electoral Arrangements for South Ribble Borough Council by 6 January 2014.

I hereby commend the report of the Boundary Committee to the Council.

**COUNCILLOR MRS MARGARET SMITH
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOUNDARY COMMITTEE**