

COUNCIL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Electoral Review – Further Consultation on Warding Arrangements 27 June 2013

Report of the Head of Governance

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To enable the Committee to consider whether it wishes to respond to a further consultation by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England on warding arrangements for the district, and, if so, to determine that response.

This report is public

RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) That the Committee consider whether the Council should respond to a further consultation by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) on its revised warding proposals.**
- (2) If so, that the Committee consider the response, to be agreed by the Committee to meet the LGBCE's deadline of the 15th July 2013.**

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Members may recall that at its meeting on the 14th March 2013, the Committee considered the LGBCE's draft recommendations for warding arrangements.

1.2 The Committee resolved:

- (1) That the views expressed by Carnforth Town Council and Warton Parish Council, opposing the proposal to include Warton with Carnforth in a three member ward, be endorsed.
- (2) That the City Council's response should state that a boundary between Carnforth and Warton should be drawn in such a way that the number of electors in each ward allows for a one member ward for Warton, and a two member ward for Carnforth, rather than one three member Carnforth and Warton ward as shown in the LGBCE's proposals.
- (3) That the view expressed by Morecambe Town Council, that Morecambe and Heysham would be under represented by the proposals, be endorsed and included in the city council's response.

- 1.3 A copy of the Council's response to the initial consultation is attached for Members' information (Appendix A).
- 1.4 In the light of all the consultation responses it received, the LGBCE took the view that it might be appropriate to make significant alterations to its proposals in two areas of the district, which it refers to as the Morecambe and Heysham area, and the north-west area. In the light of these alterations, the LGBCE felt it appropriate to undertake a further consultation on its revised proposals.
- 1.5 The revised proposals are set out in the attached letter to the Chief Executive and in the accompanying maps which show both the initial draft recommendations and the revised proposals (Appendix B).
- 1.6 With regard to Morecambe and Heysham, the revised proposals are for Harbour to be a three-member ward, and for Heysham Central to be a two-member ward, as at present. The original draft recommendation was for Harbour to be a two member ward and for Heysham Central to be a three member ward. The proposed boundaries, which also affect Heysham North, are shown on Map A1.
- 1.7 With regard to the north west area of the district, the revised proposal is for a three member ward covering Bolton-le-Sands and Slyne-with-Hest (rather than two two-member wards as originally recommended), a three member ward for Carnforth and Millhead, a single member ward comprising Warton (excluding Millhead) and Yealand Conyers, and a single-member ward comprising Silverdale and Yealand Redmayne. The proposed boundaries are shown on Map B1. The revised proposals have been made in the light of a number of objections to the original draft recommendation for a three-member Carnforth and Warton ward.

2.0 Proposal Details

- 2.1 The Council now has the opportunity to comment on these draft revised proposals, as do the parish councils and any interested individuals. Whether or not the Council responds through this Committee, individual members and groups may submit their own comments to the LGBCE.
- 2.2 It should be noted that this consultation relates only to the specific revised proposals, as the LGBCE has indicated that it has already made its decision on the remainder of its draft recommendations affecting the rest of the district.
- 2.3 The Committee is asked to consider whether it wishes to submit a response to the latest consultation on behalf of the Council, and if so, to formulate that response, so that the LGBCE's deadline of the 15th July 2013 is met.

3.0 Options and Options Analysis (including risk assessment)

- 3.1 The options open to the Committee are:
 - to decide not to respond to the current consultation, or
 - to submit a response commenting on the revised proposals.

3.2 If the Committee wishes to respond to the consultation, it may wish to formulate the response at this meeting, or to request the Democratic Services Manager to draft a response based on the Committee's comments at this meeting, and to consult with the Chairman before sending it to the LGBCE to meet the deadline

4.0 Conclusion

4.1 The Committee's views are sought.

CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT (including Health & Safety, Equality & Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)
--

None directly arising from this report. The Commission aims to recommend warding patterns that have good electoral equality, reflect community identities and interests and provide for effective and convenient local government.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

None directly arising from this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None directly arising from this report. The changes will not have any material impact on City Council budgets.

OTHER RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

Human Resources: None

Information Services: None

Property: None

Open Spaces: None

SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

BACKGROUND PAPERS	Contact Officer: Debbie Chambers
--------------------------	---

None

Telephone: 01524 582057

E-mail: dchambers@lancaster.gov.uk

Ref: