

Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the North West



Contents

	Summary	3
1	What is the Boundary Commission for England?	5
2	Background to the 2018 Review	7
3	Revised proposals for the North West	11
	The sub-region split	11
	Cumbria	12
	Lancashire	15
	Merseyside (less the Wirral)	31
	Greater Manchester, Wirral, and Cheshire	33
4	How to have your say	51
	Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	53

Summary

Who we are and what we do

The Boundary Commission for England is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is responsible for reviewing Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England.

The 2018 Review

We have the task of periodically reviewing the boundaries of all the Parliamentary constituencies in England. We are currently conducting a review on the basis of new rules laid down by Parliament. These rules involve a significant reduction in the number of constituencies in England (from 533 to 501), resulting in the number of constituencies in the North West reducing by seven, to 68. The rules also require that every constituency – apart from two specified exceptions¹ – must have an electorate that is no smaller than 71,031 and no larger than 78,507.

How did we conduct the 2018 Review?

We published our initial proposals for new boundaries in September 2016 and consulted on them. We received written comments and oral submissions at public hearings held in each region. We published all the comments we received and we held a second consultation exercise in relation to them in March 2017. We are very grateful for all the comments that these two consultation exercises have generated. We have now completed the next stage of the review process and we are now publishing our revised proposals. For each region, the revised proposals report sets

out our analysis of all the responses to our initial proposals in the first and second consultations, and the conclusions we have reached as to how those proposals should be revised as a result. The annex to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency in our revised proposals for the relevant region; maps to illustrate these constituencies can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit near you.

What are the revised proposals for the North West?

We have revised the composition of 25 of the 68 constituencies we proposed in September 2016. After careful consideration, we have decided not to make any revisions to the composition of the remaining 43. In some instances, however, we have revised our proposed names for these constituencies. Under our revised proposals, 13 constituencies in the North West would be the same as they are under the existing arrangements.

As it was not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties, our initial proposals grouped some local authority areas into sub-regions. It was also necessary to propose some constituencies that cross county or unitary authority boundaries. Following consideration of the representations made on our initial proposals, our revised proposal sub-regions remain unchanged from those initial proposals, as shown in the table overleaf.

¹ The specific exemptions in England to the rules on constituency size are the two constituencies in the Isle of Wight.

Sub-region	Existing allocation	Allocation under our revised proposals
Cumbria	6	5
Lancashire	16	14
Merseyside (less the Wirral)	11	10
Greater Manchester, the Wirral, and Cheshire (Cheshire West and Chester, and Cheshire East)	42	39

As in the initial proposals, we are recommending four cross-county constituencies. We have proposed two constituencies that contain electors from both Cheshire and Greater Manchester – one that combines the towns of Altrincham and Knutsford, and another that combines the town of Wilmslow, and the Stockport Borough suburb of Hazel Grove.

Although we have treated Lancashire and Merseyside as separate sub-regions, we have proposed a constituency that crosses the county boundary, which combines three wards from the Borough of West Lancashire with the town of Southport.

We recommend that one constituency crosses the county boundary between Cheshire and the Wirral, as in the initial proposals.

In Cumbria, we have proposed five constituencies contained entirely within the county, making one change to our initial proposals, affecting the Barrow and Furness, and Workington and Whitehaven constituencies, the latter of which we have recommended an alternative name.

In Lancashire, we have reconfigured nine constituencies, one of which also has an alternative name proposed.

We have recommended no changes to the initial proposals in Merseyside.

In the Greater Manchester, the Wirral, and Cheshire sub-region, we have proposed changes to the composition of 14 of the initially proposed constituencies, including three in which we propose that the name of the constituency also be changed. We have further recommended that two constituencies should be changed by name only.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make recommendations to the Government.

We ask everyone wishing to contribute to the design of the new constituencies to first look at the revised proposals report, and accompanying maps, before responding to us. The best way to respond to our revised proposals is through our consultation website: www.bce2018.org.uk.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

1.1 The Boundary Commission for England (BCE) is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required by Parliament to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every five years. Our role is to make recommendations to Parliament for new constituency boundaries. We also make recommendations for any changes in the names of individual constituencies.

1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but by convention he or she does not participate in the formulation of the Commission's recommendations, nor in the conduct of the review. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners take decisions on what recommendations to make for new constituency boundaries. They are assisted in their task by 21 assistant commissioners (two or three allocated to each of the nine regions of England). Further information about the Commissioners and assistant commissioners can be found in the 'About us' section of our corporate website.²

1.3 Our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk contains all the information needed to view and comment on our revised proposals. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, by calling 020 7276 1102, or by writing to:

The Secretary to the Commission
Boundary Commission for England
35 Great Smith Street
London
SW1P 3BQ

² <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/about-us>

2 Background to the 2018 Review

2.1 There are four Boundary Commissions covering the UK with separate Commissions for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 states that they must conduct a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries, and make recommendations to Government, every five years. Under the current review, we must report in September 2018. The four Commissions work separately, and this report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England and, in particular, introduces our revised proposals for the North West.

2.2 Parliamentary boundaries are important, as they define the area in which voters will elect a Member of Parliament. If our recommendations are accepted, they would be used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.

2.3 The legislation we work to states that there will be 600 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – a reduction of 50 from the current number. For England, that means that the number of constituencies must reduce from 533 to 501. There are also new rules that the Commission has to adhere to when conducting the review – a full set of rules can be found in our Guide to the 2018 Review of Parliamentary constituencies (the Guide),³ published in the summer of 2016, but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules state that every constituency we recommend (with the exception of two covering the Isle of Wight) must contain between 71,031 and 78,507 electors.

2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, where achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim but not an overriding legal necessity. For example, in England, the largest constituency currently has around twice as many electors as the smallest. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the reduction in the total number of constituencies, means that a significant scale of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.

2.5 If implemented, the recommendations that we will make in September 2018 will be the first set of boundaries to be defined under the new rules. While there has to be a significant amount of change across the country, we will, where possible, try to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors. Under the Act, we have a challenging job to do in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in a pattern of constituencies that is unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless, the review has been one that we have conducted in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

2.6 The revised proposals that we set out in this report, and in the reports for the other eight regions across England, are made on the basis of the evidence we received during two consultation exercises, the careful consideration of our assistant commissioners and the best judgement of the three Boundary Commissioners. We are

³ Available at <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/2018-review>.

confident that these revised proposals strike the best balance between the statutory factors and, having consulted twice already, we are close to settling on a pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There may be particular areas across the country where our judgement has been a balanced and marginal one between competing alternatives, and in such cases, we have made clear that we are looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many areas we are persuaded by the evidence we have received thus far, and we would therefore require new and significantly stronger arguments to make us depart from our revised proposals. If it exists, such new and compelling evidence would be welcome. However, we will not be assisted by repetition of arguments that have already been made, and which we have already considered. The requirement to keep constituencies within the permitted range of electors is strict, but otherwise we have sought to balance often conflicting considerations. Our proposals must also be comprehensive. We are acutely conscious that very often a change in one constituency necessarily requires an alteration in another and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.

2.7 The Guide contains further detailed background, and explains all the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review, in greater depth than in this consultation document. We encourage anyone wishing to be involved in the review to read the Guide, to enable greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals.

The rules in the legislation

2.8 The rules contained in the legislation state that every constituency in England (except two covering the Isle of Wight) must have an electorate of between 71,031 and 78,507 – that is, 5% either side of the electoral quota of 74,769. The legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may also take into account:

- special geographical considerations, including the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency
- local government boundaries as they existed on 7 May 2015
- boundaries of existing constituencies
- any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies.

2.9 It is essential to understand that none of the factors mentioned in the list above overrides the necessity to achieve an electorate in each constituency that is within the range allowed, as explained previously. In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that we are obliged to take into account local government boundaries as they existed in May 2015. Our initial proposals for the region and the accompanying maps were based on the wards as they existed in May 2015, and our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. The Guide outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries that have been amended since 2015.

2.10 In our initial proposals, we took into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we could, and tried to retain existing constituencies where possible, so long as the other factors could also be satisfied. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, because of the scale of change required to fulfil the obligations imposed on us by the new rules, this proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 18% of the existing constituencies in the North West – the remainder were new constituencies (although in a number of cases we were able to limit the changes to existing constituencies, making only minor changes as necessary to enable us to comply with the new rules).

2.11 Among the many arguments we heard in response to the consultations on our initial proposals was the need to have particular regard to this factor of the rules to which we work. While some respondents put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, it is the Commission's task to balance all the factors. As we set out in the course of this report, our revised proposals retain 13 (17%) of the existing 75 constituencies in the North West.

The use of the regions used for European elections

2.12 Our proposals are based on the nine regions used for European elections. This report relates to the North West. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the

2018 Review we decided, in agreement with all the main political parties, to use these regions as a basis for working out our initial proposals. You can find more details in the Guide and on our website. We stated in our initial proposals report that, while this approach does not prevent anyone from making proposals to us that cross regional boundaries, we would need to have compelling reasons provided to us to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.

2.13 In response to the consultations on our initial proposals, we did not receive sufficient evidence across the country to suggest that we should depart from the regional approach to this review. Therefore, this report, and all other regional reports, continues to use the regional boundaries as a basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for the review

Stage one – initial proposals

2.14 We began this review in February 2016 by publishing breakdowns of the electorate for each ward, local government authority and existing constituency, which were prepared using electorate data provided by local authorities and the Office for National Statistics. These are available on the data pages of our corporate website.⁴ The Commission spent a number of months considering the factors outlined above and drawing up our initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England's nine regions on 13 September 2016.

⁴ <http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/data-and-resources>

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

2.15 We consulted on our initial proposals for 12 weeks, from 13 September 2016 to 5 December 2016. This consultation period also included holding 36 public hearings, at which people had the opportunity to make oral representations. We received more than 18,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including more than 2,800 unique written representations relating to the North West. We also heard more than 170 oral representations at the five public hearings in the North West. We are grateful to all those who took the time and trouble to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

2.16 The legislation requires us to publish all the representations we received on our initial proposals, and to allow people to send us comments on them for a four-week period. We published the representations on 28 February 2017 and invited comments on them until 27 March 2017. We received more than 7,500 unique written representations across the country as a whole during those four weeks.

Stage four – publication of revised proposals

2.17 As we outline in chapter 3, having considered the evidence presented to us, we have decided that the evidence is such that it is appropriate to revise our initial proposals in some areas. Therefore, as we are required to do (under the legislation), on 17 October 2017, we are publishing this report – Revised proposals for new

constituency boundaries in the North West – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory eight-week period, which closes on 11 December 2017. Unlike the initial consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings, nor is there a repeat of the four-week period for commenting on the representations of others. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period.

Stage five – final recommendations

2.18 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 11 December 2017, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before making final recommendations to the Government. The legislation states that we must do this during September 2018. Further details about what the Government and Parliament must do to implement our recommendations are contained in the Guide.

2.19 At the launch of each stage of consultation, we have taken – and are continuing to take – all reasonable steps to publicise our proposals, so that as many people as possible are aware of the consultation and can take the opportunity to contribute to our review of constituencies.

3 Revised proposals for the North West

3.1 In July 2016, we arranged for the appointment of three assistant commissioners for the North West – Neil Ward, Nicholas Elliott, and Graeme Clarke – to assist us with the analysis of the representations received during the first two consultation periods. This included chairing public hearings held in the region to collect oral evidence, as follows:

- Manchester: 11–12 October 2016
- Chester: 13–14 October 2016
- Carlisle: 17–18 October 2016
- Liverpool: 20–21 October 2016
- Lancaster: 24–25 October 2016.

3.2 We asked the assistant commissioners to consider all the written and oral representations, and to make recommendations to us on whether our initial proposals should be revised, in light of evidence provided in the representations. It is important to stress that the assistant commissioners had no involvement in developing – and therefore no vested interest in supporting – our initial proposals. Accordingly, they came to the analysis with an independent mind, open to viable alternative proposals supported by evidence. We are incredibly grateful for the thorough and methodical approach the assistant commissioners have taken to their work.

3.3 What follows in this chapter is:

- a brief recap of our initial proposals
- a description of the counter-proposals put forward during the consultations
- the assistant commissioners’ analysis of the strength of the arguments for adoption of any of those counter-proposals
- our decision on whether or not to make changes to our proposals in the given area.

3.4 A tabular summary of the revised constituencies we now propose appears at Annex A to this report.

3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response, we also include the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345. This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bce2018.org.uk. All representations received in response to the first two consultations are publicly available on this website. The representations received in response to these revised proposals will be published at the end of the review.

The sub-region split

3.6 In our initial proposals, we decided to divide the North West into four sub-regions. These were: Cumbria; Lancashire; Merseyside (less the Wirral); and Greater Manchester, the Wirral, and Cheshire. The reduction of seven from the existing 75 constituencies in the region meant that significant change was required. As a result, under the initial proposals only 14 of the current 75 constituencies had been left unchanged. Despite treating Lancashire and

Merseyside as separate sub-regions, we proposed that the Southport constituency would cross the county boundary, combining the town with three wards from the borough of West Lancashire. Additionally, we initially proposed two constituencies (Altrincham and Tatton Park, and Bramhall and Poynton) that contained wards from both Cheshire and Greater Manchester.

3.7 There was support for our proposed sub-regional arrangement. The counter-proposals of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246), the Labour Party (BCE-31193), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373), and the representation of the Green Party (BCE-29032) did not suggest any different sub-regions. However, a counter-proposal from Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) suggested a constituency which crossed the Greater Manchester and Lancashire county boundary.

3.8 We received proposals to split wards in several constituencies. Our assistant commissioners advised us that, in the main, these recommendations provided small benefit to the wider community, and none of the proposals were ‘exceptional or compelling’ or in any way met this criteria. Therefore, they did not recommend any counter-proposals that suggest a division of wards, and we concur with their judgement.

Cumbria

3.9 Of the six existing constituencies in Cumbria, none are within the permitted electorate range. With its entitlement to 5.02 constituencies, under our initial proposals the number of constituencies within Cumbria was reduced by one

to give the sub-region a total of five constituencies. Significant changes were required to bring these five constituencies within the permitted electorate range.

3.10 In the north of the county we proposed a Carlisle constituency, coterminous with the boundaries of Carlisle City Council, and encompassing the city and its rural hinterland.

3.11 We proposed that the existing Barrow and Furness constituency, which needed to gain electors in order to be within the permitted range, should extend northwards rather than eastwards, due to poor transport links across Cartmel Sands. Noting that the electorate of the existing Copeland constituency (60,785) was well outside the permitted electorate range, we also suggested the creation of a coastal Workington and Whitehaven constituency in the west, extending from the town of Maryport down to the River Mite.

3.12 We then divided the Lakeland areas of Cumbria along an east-west axis creating the constituencies of Penrith and Solway, and Westmorland and Lonsdale. In our initial proposals, we proposed that the town of Appleby-in-Westmorland should be included in our Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency, which also contained the southern lakes, while the northern lakes and fells would be included in the Penrith and Solway constituency that extended to the Solway Firth in the west.

3.13 We received broad support for the initial proposals in Cumbria, particularly for the proposed constituencies of Carlisle, and Penrith and Solway, the latter of which prompted a small letter writing campaign in support of the initial proposals

(BCE-33241). The official responses to the initial proposals from the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), and the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) supported the initial proposals in full. The Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) suggested minor changes to all the constituencies within Cumbria. The Green Party (BCE-29032) did not submit a counter-proposal for any constituencies in the county.

3.14 Two counter-proposals suggesting larger-scale change in the county were received from the Morecambe Bay Independents (BCE-25945), and from Councillor Darren Clifford (BCE-32939) including a proposal for a constituency that crossed the county boundary into Lancashire, thereby altering our sub-regional arrangement. This proposal will be addressed in further detail later when we come to consider Lancashire.

3.15 Across the county, two principal issues with the initial proposals arose. The first was the question raised in representations on whether the Bootle ward on the west coast, which we suggested should be included in the Barrow and Furness constituency, might more appropriately be included in the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. The second was whether the ward of Dalston, which was proposed to be part of the Carlisle constituency, should be included in Penrith and Solway, as suggested by the Labour Party.

3.16 The Labour Party (BCE-40903) on a broader front argued that ‘the wards of Crosby Ravensworth and Long Marton look towards the market town of Appleby as their local centre, being historically

part of Westmorland, and that therefore their inclusion in the Westmorland & Lonsdale CC breaks fewer ties and makes the constituency a better shape.’ Simon Bennett (BCE-19327) and Peter Naylor (BCE-27655) shared this view. To accommodate this change, the Labour Party would transfer the Dalston ward to be included within the Penrith and Solway constituency. In light of this suggestion, our assistant commissioners investigated whether the evidence provided supported this proposition. They accepted that a valid case existed in respect of the proposal to reinforce the links between Crosby Ravensworth and Long Marton wards with the town of Appleby but did not believe it was sufficiently strong to require the annexation of Dalston ward from the Carlisle constituency, particularly in the light of other representations that confirmed the integral nature of Dalston to the rest of the city of Carlisle. David Mallinson (BCE-21219) for example, stated: ‘I agree with the new boundary position including Dalston with the Carlisle constituency. Dalston is closely linked to Carlisle over any other local area and should be within the boundary of Carlisle. Local transport routes and public services are all linked to Carlisle. The MP for Carlisle should be the MP for Dalston.’ On day two of the public hearing in Carlisle, Neville Lishman (BCE-32891) further highlighted the connections of the Dalston ward to the rest of Carlisle, stating that ‘Carlisle racecourse, after its name, is in the Dalston ward. The Nestlé plant, a major employer for Carlisle people, is in the Dalston ward. You come off the motorway at junction 42 for Carlisle south; junction 42 is in the Dalston ward.’

3.17 Similar support was expressed by the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373), and by members of the public such as David Ward (BCE-21819) and Robert Currie (BCE-32846).

3.18 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence presented, and in light of the considerable support for the proposed Carlisle constituency, and in the absence of more persuasive evidence to support the Labour Party's counter-proposal, recommended to us that the initial proposals should not be altered. Having considered the evidence as presented by the assistant commissioners, we have decided not to modify the initial proposal for the Carlisle constituency.

3.19 With respect to the Barrow and Furness constituency, the Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) considered that Bootle ward looks more to the north than the south, being part of the chain of coastal and industrial communities of West Cumbria, and has stronger ties with Seascale, Sellafield, and Whitehaven. As a consequence they proposed that Bootle ward should be moved from the Barrow and Furness constituency (as put forward in the initial proposals), into the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. This view was shared by a number of residents of Bootle ward. The representation sent in by David Robson (BCE-33808) is a typical example of this, in which he states: 'Most of what is currently South Copeland looks north to Whitehaven for its services and main sources of employment not to Barrow-in-Furness. The main hospital is, for now at least, in Whitehaven. The principal places of employment are at Sellafield and Whitehaven. Shopping is also generally

based there. The normal daily routine of people's lives is based to the north.' John Woodcock, the Member of Parliament for Barrow and Furness (BCE-29535), told us that placing Bootle ward in the Barrow and Furness constituency would lead to 'a greater division of the existing constituency and a further breaking of local ties than would otherwise be necessary.'

3.20 Opposition to this change was limited. The Conservative Party response (BCE-40902) was that the Bootle ward should be in the same constituency as the town of Millom. Another representation, from Christopher Whiteside (BCE-32871), argued that the initial proposal for Barrow and Furness had a strong geographical border at Ravenglass, and that placing a border between Bootle ward and Millom Without ward would 'make much less sense.'

3.21 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence that had been received, and were persuaded by the arguments put forward by residents of the Bootle ward that it does indeed look north for its services and community links. They recommended that the initial proposals for Cumbria should be amended to accommodate the transfer of the Bootle ward from the Barrow and Furness constituency into the Workington and Whitehaven constituency. They further suggested that, as proposed by some representations, the proposed name of the Workington and Whitehaven constituency should be changed to West Cumbria. Having considered the evidence, we agreed with the recommendations of our assistant commissioners. In respect of the Westmorland and Lonsdale, and Penrith and Solway constituencies, our

assistant commissioners noted that very few representations or counter-proposals were received. Due to the broad support of the proposals generally, they recommend that the initial proposals for these constituencies should remain unaltered. We agree with them.

Lancashire

3.22 Of the 16 existing constituencies currently within Lancashire, three (Chorley, South Ribble, and Ribble Valley) have electorates that are within the permitted range, and many of the remaining constituencies have electorates that are significantly lower than the permitted range. In formulating our initial proposals we noted that Lancashire's entitlement to 14.06 constituencies meant that the county could have been treated on its own, but we proposed the inclusion of three West Lancashire Borough wards in a cross-county Southport constituency – primarily so that the town of Formby would not be divided.

3.23 The low electorates of both the Morecambe and Lunesdale (63,283) and Lancaster and Fleetwood (58,789) constituencies meant that we proposed the combination of both Lancaster and Morecambe into one constituency, although this did not include Lancaster University, which is located in the mostly rural University & Scotforth Rural ward. The geographically large ward sizes, but conversely small ward electorates, led us to include this ward in a constituency that stretched from the Cumbrian border to the estuary of the River Wyre and to the outskirts of the City of Preston, which was named North Lancashire.

3.24 On the Fylde, the electorates of both Blackpool South (54,607) and Blackpool North and Cleveleys (60,324) were particularly low, and we proposed modifications to both. We proposed that the Kilnhouse, and St. Leonard's wards be transferred to the Blackpool South constituency, and that the Fylde constituency should include the four wards comprising the town of Poulton-le-Fylde to increase its electorate.

3.25 With an electorate of 56,110, Preston had the fourth lowest total electorate in the North West. We suggested that the whole of the city area, including Fulwood, could be included in a compact, urban constituency.

3.26 In our initial proposals, we recommended a minor change to the existing Blackburn constituency – the transfer of the Fernhurst ward from the existing Rossendale and Darwen constituency. In turn, we proposed that Rossendale and Darwen should gain two wards from the existing Hyndburn constituency to bring it within the permitted electorate range, and to create a geographically better shaped constituency.

3.27 As a result of these changes, the Hyndburn constituency needed to increase in electors so that it was within the permitted electorate range. We proposed the inclusion of three wards on the eastern side of the constituency from the existing Burnley constituency and, in view of these changes, suggested that the constituency should be called Accrington. Burnley meanwhile, in addition to the change mentioned above, would extend northwards to include eight wards from the existing Pendle constituency.

3.28 Although the electorate of the existing Ribble Valley constituency was within the permitted electorate range (75,348), as a result of the loss of two constituencies in the county and of changes made elsewhere, we suggested that the remainder of the existing Pendle constituency be combined with a number of wards from the existing Ribble Valley constituency and included them in a Clitheroe and Colne constituency.

3.29 With respect to the existing West Lancashire constituency, we proposed that this was changed only by the inclusion of the wards of Rufford, and Eccleston and Mawdesley from the existing South Ribble constituency. We further proposed that the wards of North Meols, Hesketh-with-Beconsall, and Tarleton should be transferred from the existing South Ribble constituency to our proposed Southport constituency. The South Ribble constituency would then include several wards in the east from the existing Ribble Valley constituency.

3.30 In our initial proposals, we suggested that the constituency of Chorley should remain unchanged.

3.31 Our initial proposals for Lancashire were supported in full by the Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) and accepted by the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373). The Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) supported three of the proposed constituencies (Chorley, Blackburn, and Rossendale and Darwen) and submitted counter-proposals for the remaining 11 constituencies. The Green Party (BCE-29032) did not submit a counter-proposal for any of the 14 constituencies.

3.32 We noted that the initial proposal for the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency was amongst the most contentious in the region. As well as attracting hundreds of individual representations from residents of both Lancaster and Morecambe, we received several sets of letter writing campaigns submitted by the Member of Parliament for Morecambe and Lunesdale, David Morris, and two further petitions signed by hundreds of residents from Lancaster.

3.33 The main objection to the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency was that the two towns had distinct and separate identities. Some respondents drew attention to the revised proposals report from the discontinued 2013 Review in which the then assistant commissioners had suggested that ‘to combine them [Morecambe and Lancaster] would disrupt local ties and would fly in the face of the clearly defined views of local people’. During the current review, we also noted the passion with which many respondents, mostly located within Morecambe, expressed their wish to remain in a separate constituency to Lancaster. Many residents of Morecambe held the view that sharing Parliamentary representation with Lancaster would lead to Morecambe being neglected, as for example expressed by Raymond Axon (BCE-33672) who stated: ‘I believe that Morecambe should not be linked to Lancaster because as it is we do not have our own council but come under Lancaster City Council. This arrangement fails because Morecambe is very much the poor relation. Most of our tourist attractions have been eradicated we no longer have a theatre, a swimming pool, a fun fair etc. Our sea front consists of large swathes of boarded up land, burnt out

tourist attractions.’ This view was shared by several others, for instance Howard Carter (BCE-18332), who remarked that ‘Lancaster and Morecambe are totally different in terms of history, architecture, temperament, problems and issues ... Historically, Lancaster has treated Morecambe poorly. It has acted as a gatekeeper.’

3.34 At day one of the Lancaster public hearing, the Member of Parliament for Morecambe and Lunesdale, David Morris (BCE-32907), gave further evidence describing the antipathy of many of Morecambe’s residents towards Lancaster, stating that ‘there is still a lot of bad blood following the merger of the councils of Morecambe and Lancaster. This is the reason why the council has to meet in both Lancaster and Morecambe to this day’; and further, that ‘In Morecambe there is a universally held feeling that Lancaster takes all of Morecambe’s funding on a council level and that to support one area is always to the detriment of the other. I do not feel that one Member of Parliament would be able to support the differing needs of a student city and a seaside resort properly or effectively.’ Mr Morris also subsequently submitted a letter writing campaign, comprised of four petition questions, to both the initial and secondary consultations (BCE-33223, BCE-33225, BCE-33227, BCE-41164, BCE-41163, and BCE-41165). This letter writing campaign contained submissions from over 6,000 respondents, the vast majority of which opposed our proposals for both the Lancaster and Morecambe, and North Lancashire constituencies. Emma Smith, a former Councillor for Heysham South ward (BCE-32910) who also spoke at day one of the public hearing, commented that ‘at its heart Lancaster is a city and

Morecambe is a seaside town. It cannot possibly be allowed for Morecambe to become a suburb of Lancaster. If this happens Morecambe would suffer. An MP for both areas would have to take sides and prioritise.’

3.35 The exclusion of Lancaster University, which is located in the mostly rural University & Scotforth Rural ward, was also a major point of opposition to the proposals. Several respondents, some of whom otherwise supported the initial proposals, considered the separation of Lancaster University from the Lancaster constituency to be unacceptable. Councillor Oscar Thynne (BCE-29698) for instance commented: ‘I am greatly concerned about the exclusion of Lancaster University from the proposed constituency. The university plays a very important role within the district, especially the city centre, and it is wrong to exclude it.’ This view was shared by many others, such as Kate Jackson (BCE-17912), Catherine Pacey (BCE-18028), and Stephen Humphrey (BCE-23490).

3.36 Conversely, we also noted that several representations were received that strongly supported the initial proposals. In their response to the initial consultation, the Labour Party (BCE-31193) stated that ‘the Commission’s proposed Lancaster & Morecambe CC is a logical seat which retains both towns intact.’ The Member of Parliament for Lancaster and Fleetwood, Cat Smith (BCE-32918), agreed and gave further evidence regarding the links between the two towns, stating that: ‘The people in Lancaster, Morecambe and Heysham they all use the same public services, that is the Royal Lancaster Infirmary, which is the main hospital for

accident and emergency and maternity services. Post-16 education outside school provision is delivered at the Lancashire and Morecambe College. Public transport links across this constituency are strong with regular bus services covering Heysham, Morecambe and Lancaster, as well as a railway service linking the two populations. Whilst Heysham, Morecambe and Lancaster all have very different and distinct identities, and I do not dispute that, they share far more in common with each other than they do with anywhere else in the area.'

3.37 In her representation (BCE-32918), Ms Smith also outlined a large number of organisations across various sectors that currently work between both Lancaster and Morecambe, including the Lancaster and Morecambe Hindu Society, Lancaster and Morecambe Rail Users Group, Lancaster and Morecambe Parents Defending Education, Lancaster and Morecambe Autistic Society, Lancaster and Morecambe District National Union of Teachers, and Lancaster and Morecambe Dementia Community Forum. On the exclusion of the University from the proposed Lancaster and Morecambe constituency, Ms Smith remarked that 'I would like to see a proposal which did include the university, although having looked at the numbers myself I can see that there is a challenge unless it was to look seriously at dividing electoral divisions within a ward to pull out the campus itself.' She further commented that 'it is important to recognise that Lancaster University is an out of city campus, that is how it was designed, and the vast majority of students and as far as I am aware all the academics do live in Lancaster itself,

so a Lancaster and Morecambe MP would have an interest in being a good representative to the university whether or not it was included in the seat.' Councillor Colin Hartley (BCE-33100) expressed the view that it was unnecessary for the University to be included in the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency, stating: 'Personally, I think too much is being made of this. Many students live in Lancaster and not on campus, so would be included in the proposed boundary. Lots of those living on campus are from overseas so are not eligible to vote in national elections.'

3.38 In respect of the North Lancashire constituency, we noted that several respondents commented on the geographical size of the constituency, the lack of community links, and the number of local authorities that were contained within the constituency. The Conservative Party (BCE-33246) remarked that although we had indicated in our initial proposals that we had linked the towns Morecambe and Lancaster to avoid the creation of a 'geographically huge constituency that would wrap around the City of Lancaster', by doing so 'the Commission's proposed North Lancashire constituency does exactly this. It is huge being 44% of the area of County of Lancashire.' This view was shared by the Green Party (BCE-29032), and also by Terry Largan (BCE-30392), who stated that 'BCE's proposed North Lancashire constituency contains parts of four boroughs and is constructed from parts of four existing constituencies. Such a multiple hybrid constituency strongly indicates a considerable degree of broken ties and insufficient respecting of local government boundaries and the boundaries of

existing constituencies', and by Lancaster City Council (BCE-20679), who said 'the proposed new North Lancashire constituency is too geographically spread across communities served by four local authorities.'

3.39 Other objections to the proposed North Lancashire constituency came from residents in the towns of Carnforth and Silverdale, who also expressed concerns regarding the size of the constituency. One example is the representation of Chris Heath (BCE-33144), who at the Lancaster public hearing commented: 'I must admit I was quite surprised when I saw the proposals that came out and saw that we had been put into this very big, very nebulous constituency with effectively only one transport link from north to south and it takes at least 40 minutes or so to drive if you are driving at the top speed on the motorway. There is very little commonality of interest between people on the north Preston border area or even off up along the Ribble Valley to people on the Morecambe Bay coast.' Liz Withey (BCE-20544) remarked 'I think the area covered by the proposed constituency is too wide and too varied. Carnforth is coastal and needs to be grouped with other similar areas with similar issues. I do not feel we have much in common with north Preston or the Ribble valley and I fear many of our issues would be forgotten.'

3.40 Others, such as the Labour Party (BCE-40903), did not share this opinion. In their representation, the Labour Party asserted that 'we do not accept that the acreage of the proposed North Lancashire CC is by itself a significant objection to it. It reflects the fact that this a sparsely

populated area, and that the electorate in the county of Lancashire is unevenly distributed, heavily concentrated in the south and west of the county.' Some residents of areas proposed to be included in the North Lancashire constituency were supportive of the proposals such as Mark Nelson (BCE-15530) who said: 'I now live in the new seat of North Lancashire, about which I am very happy indeed, I believe all wards within this seat will have much in common. Creating a new seat of Morecambe and Lancaster makes much more sense, the two places sit together with ease.' A similar view was shared by Richard Austen-Baker (BCE-15917) who commented 'I think the proposed North Lancashire constituency makes excellent sense. It is overwhelmingly rural, so the vast bulk of electors have this rural factor in common. The economies of most of the communities within the new boundaries depend wholly or very heavily on agriculture, country sports and associated activity, so an MP for this constituency would have a clear idea about the economic and business context and priorities of his or her constituents.'

3.41 We noted that counter-proposals for the two constituencies largely followed one of two patterns: they either supported the aim of linking the towns of Morecambe and Lancaster together in one constituency and suggested minor alterations, for example to include the University in the same constituency as the City of Lancaster; or alternatively, they took the view that Morecambe and Lancaster were two distinct places with their own identity, and that combining the two into one constituency would cause further disruption to local ties in Lancashire.

3.42 David Morris MP outlined his support for the counter-proposal of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) which, instead of combining Lancaster and Morecambe into one constituency, sought to supplement the electorate of the existing Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency with the addition of the two wards of Bulk and Lower Lune Valley, and proposed a Lancaster and Wyre constituency that contained the remaining wards from the Lancaster City Council area, and included five wards from Preston Borough (currently within the existing Wyre and Preston North constituency). On the exclusion of the University from the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency, as in the initial proposals, the Conservative Party remarked that ‘To separate Lancaster University from the Lancaster seat is particularly strange.’ In respect of including the Bulk ward within their proposed Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency, the Conservative Party argued that this configuration represented ‘the least worst’ option, and noted ‘that the ward does have links with the Skerton wards which are already in the Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency.’ Other counter-proposals, such as that of Terry Lorgan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907), proposed a very similar pattern of constituencies to that of the Conservative Party, with the main differences being the inclusion of the Garrison ward in a Lancaster and Fulwood constituency and the inclusion of the Preesall, and Hambleton & Stalmine wards in a Blackpool North and Wyre constituency. The counter-proposals submitted by Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972) suggested an identical

Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency to the Conservative Party and put forward alternative configurations of the Lancaster and Wyre constituency.

3.43 However, many respondents objected to any proposal that would include the Bulk ward in a Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency, thus dividing it from the rest of Lancaster. In response to the Conservative Party counter-proposals, numerous representatives at the Lancaster public hearing indicated their strong belief that the Bulk ward should not be separated from Lancaster. At the Lancaster public hearing Andrew King (BCE-32995) stated ‘I have walked here today from my home in 15 minutes. I am in the centre of Lancaster in ten minutes. To suggest that we are in some way not part of Lancaster is almost unbelievable that this proposal has been made’; and Paul Smith (BCE-33020) stated: ‘I am aware of the counter-proposal that involves splitting Bulk. As a resident of Bulk I find it slightly preposterous my representation would be then tied to Morecambe and rural parts of Lancashire rather than the city centre I live 10 minutes’ walk from.’ We received a petition objecting to the Conservative Party proposals to include Bulk ward in the Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency, specifically the Ridge, Newton and Freehold communities, with 417 signatories (BCE-33212), in addition to a letter writing campaign with 359 signatories, supporting the combining of Morecambe, Heysham, and Lancaster into a single urban constituency (BCE-34192).

3.44 The counter-proposal of Oliver Raven (BCE-39493) agreed with the principle of combining Lancaster and Morecambe into one constituency, and proposed a configuration which included the University & Scotforth Rural ward. However, in this counter-proposal the transfer of the ward to Lancaster and Morecambe is offset by the inclusion of the Elswick and Little Ecclestone, and Singleton and Greenhalgh wards in his proposed Carnforth and Garstang constituency. Many other representations, such as those from Councillor James Leyshon (BCE-33089), Christopher Morris (BCE-27243), and Graham Jameson (BCE-23237) among others, suggested that the Bolton & Slyne ward, which is currently within the Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency, would be more appropriately placed in a North Lancashire constituency so that the University could be included in the Morecambe and Lancaster constituency. In his representation at the Lancaster public hearing, Councillor Leyshon remarked: 'I think actually there are a lot of areas up towards the north of the proposed constituency, for example in Bolton-le-Slyne. I have spoken to representatives from different parties, ... who actually feel like areas, for example in Bolton-le-Slyne, would fit much more in a more rural northern seat.'

3.45 We noted the oral evidence provided by Councillor Darren Clifford (BCE-32939), who spoke on behalf of Morecambe Town Council. In his representation, he outlined a counter-proposal to return to the historic constituency of 'Morecambe and Lonsdale, to reflect the pre 1983 boundary and retains its distinct identity as a seaside town and community. Morecambe

and Lonsdale existed until 1983 and incorporated Morecambe, Heysham, Carnforth and parts of the Ulverston rural district, including Grange.' We noted that this counter-proposal crosses the county boundary, and thus alters the pattern of every constituency in Cumbria as outlined in the initial proposals. We noted the similar proposal suggested by Geoff Knight (BCE-25945), who submitted a representation on behalf of the Morecambe Bay Independents, which also proposed a Morecambe and Lonsdale constituency.

3.46 Our assistant commissioners carefully considered the evidence that had been presented to them in respect of the North Lancashire, and Lancaster and Morecambe constituencies and investigated the counter-proposals that were received.

3.47 In regard to the proposed Lancaster and Morecambe constituency, they noted that respondents located in Lancaster were broadly supportive of the initial proposals, whilst respondents located in Morecambe were opposed to them. They empathised with the strong sense of identity that was illustrated in many representations from those located in Morecambe and the genuinely held concerns regarding the focus of Lancaster County Council. However, they also considered that many representations, from respondents both in Morecambe and Lancaster, provided evidence demonstrating both the ease and frequency with which they travelled, worked, and used leisure facilities and other services across both areas. Having considered the evidence and opposition to the counter-proposal to divide the areas, particularly the

objections raised regarding the Bulk ward, our assistant commissioners did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received such as to justify Morecambe and Lancaster being placed in separate constituencies.

3.48 In regard to the two representations that called for the return of the historic Morecambe and Lonsdale constituency that would cross the county boundary into Cumbria, our assistant commissioners advised us that these proposals would require consequential changes to several constituencies within Cumbria which had been supported in response to the consultation. As such, they did not recommend these counter-proposals, and we concur with this recommendation.

3.49 As previously mentioned, the exclusion of the University from the proposed Lancaster and Morecambe constituency formed another point of contention for many respondents, including those in favour of the initial proposals. Our assistant commissioners investigated the counter-proposals that included the University & Scotforth Rural ward in the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency. They noted the original proposal of Oliver Raven (BCE-27877), who included the University in a Lancaster and Morecambe constituency. Consequently he proposed transferring the Samesbury & Walton ward into the North Lancashire constituency which resulted in the creation of an 'orphan ward',⁵ and having five local authorities in the constituency, which he called Garstang and Carforth. Our assistant commissioners did not consider this, or his alternative in which

Elswick and Little Ecclestone, and Singleton and Greenhalgh were transferred to a Carnforth and Garstang constituency, were persuasive counter-proposals.

3.50 They also investigated the proposals which suggested dividing wards between constituencies. Alan Borgars (BCE-30072) proposed the division of the Bolton & Slyne ward, and Andrew Marsden (BCE-15757) suggested that the Bulk ward and the University & Scotforth Rural ward itself be divided. As any split ward proposal for this reason would be solely to accommodate the University in the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency and would not have beneficial effects elsewhere, our assistant commissioners considered that these proposals did not meet the 'exceptional and compelling' circumstances required, and did not recommend these proposals. We concur with their conclusion.

3.51 Our assistant commissioners recommended to us that the University should be included in the Lancaster and Morecambe constituency, if additionally the Halton-with-Aughton ward is transferred to it, and the Bolton & Slyne ward is transferred out to the proposed North Lancashire constituency. They suggested this configuration be included as part of our revised proposals. They were persuaded of the University's importance to Lancaster and by representations suggesting that the Bolton & Slyne ward is a logical fit for the North Lancashire constituency. We also noted representations from Anna Lee (BCE-33092) and James Groves (BCE-28049) who indicated that a similar configuration

⁵ 'Orphan ward' refers to a clear minority of wards (usually just one ward) from one local authority, in a constituency where the overwhelming majority of wards are from another local authority.

in which the Ellet ward, instead of the Halton-with-Aughton ward, is placed into the constituency. This also brings both constituencies within the permitted electorate range while allowing the University to be included with Lancaster. However, neither Ms Lee nor Mr Groves actively recommended this option.

3.52 We considered the recommendation of the assistant commissioners but noted that the resulting Lancaster and Morecambe constituency would have a geographically irregular shape, and appeared somewhat artificial. We decided to review the evidence ourselves and noted representations such as those of Councillor James Leyshon (BCE-33089) and the Member of Parliament for Lancaster and Fleetwood, Cat Smith (BCE-32918), who argued that it was not essential for the University to be included in the Lancaster constituency. We were also mindful of the evidence presented from respondents in the Bolton & Slyne ward, outlining its links to Lancaster, which would be broken under the assistant commissioners' recommendation (though we accept that a similar view may prevail among residents of Halton-with-Aughton ward). While we understand the concerns that many have on the exclusion of the University from the constituency, we agree with the suggestion that student populations are often transient, and note that many students will reside off campus, where they are likely to be electors from the proposed constituency. While we recognise that the arguments are finely balanced we do not find the evidence in support of the University being included in a Lancaster constituency, at the expense of the Bolton & Slyne ward, to be sufficiently persuasive. While recognising some of the

merits of the arguments put to us by the assistant commissioners, we reject their recommendations for this constituency and make no revisions to the initial proposal for Lancaster and Morecambe.

3.53 The assistant commissioners noted the concerns about the large geographical area covered by the proposed North Lancashire constituency but were able to compare it with other similarly sized constituencies in Cumbria; they concluded that this was a natural consequence of sparsely populated rural areas and noted, as mentioned above, support offered for the make-up of this constituency. We therefore also make no revisions to the initial proposal for North Lancashire.

3.54 In the boroughs of Ribble Valley and Pendle, we noted that there was significant opposition to the initial proposals. In the Ribble Valley constituency, which currently has an electorate within the permitted range, we noted the opposition of several parish councils to the initial proposals, for example that of Chatburn Parish Council (BCE-30209), Grindleton Parish Council (BCE-30924), and Wilpshire Parish Council (BCE-22395). A recurrent theme among these representations was the concern that the communities within the existing Ribble Valley constituency would be divided between the North Lancashire, and Clitheroe and Colne constituencies. As stated by Nigel Evans, the Member of Parliament for Ribble Valley (BCE-40208), 'I have studied the submissions made by the people of the Ribble Valley – these vary from members of the public to clerks of Parish Councils. The overarching theme of the comments is that they do not wish to see the Ribble Valley disappear because they share an affiliation and a community

spirit with the area. Residents of Clitheroe do not share the same interests and identity as residents of Colne. In the same way, a person living in Gisburn does not consider him or herself to be part of the same area as a person from Silverdale.’ Other comments, such as that from Stuart McIntosh (BCE-15976), expressed concern at being included in such a large constituency (the proposed North Lancashire constituency) with no focal point. In his representation, he commented: ‘The size somewhat concerns me as it would take more than an 100 minutes to drive from the west most point (what do people in our fell-side and hilly region of the Hodder Valley have much in common with the flatlands of Knott End on Sea on the Fylde coast?) to the east most point (Horton / West Marton) within the constituency and an hour to drive from north to south (Bartle south of the M55 by Preston to Leek by Kirby Lonsdale in South Lakelands in Cumbria).’

3.55 Representations commenting on the proposed Clitheroe and Colne constituency were critical of the shape, with some respondents, such as Susan Barker (BCE-35777), stating ‘I cannot understand why a long narrow constituency along the A59 has been proposed’, and Jeff Barnett (BCE-28090) commenting that ‘A long thin area will lead to inefficient governance, with relatively polarised interests from geographically remote locations.’ These concerns were also shared by residents of the existing Pendle constituency, of which several wards were proposed to be transferred to the Clitheroe and Colne constituency in the initial proposals. Conner French (BCE-23419) questioned the ability of an MP to effectively ‘represent their local people when the constituency

is spread so far along.’ Other criticisms included the opposition to the breaking of ties within the constituency, such as from Susan Sunderland (BCE-17452) who commented: ‘I object most strongly to the proposed changes as I feel that community links will be broken. At the moment I can identify with the constituency where I live which is Pendle. My council tax is paid to Pendle Borough Council which provides the necessary local authority services.’ Hilary McAdam (BCE-14906) stated ‘In what way does it make sense to split up a continuous urban area which has existed as a functioning borough with a clear common identity for almost 50 years?’

3.56 We also received a letter writing campaign (BCE-33232) containing some 570 signatories that encouraged the Commission to use the configuration suggested at the revised proposals stage of the abandoned 2013 Review as a starting point, in which all of the Pendle local authority area was contained within a single constituency and the two wards of Briercliffe, and Cliviger with Worsthorne from Burnley Borough were added to the constituencies. Andrew Stephenson MP (BCE-30393), the Member of Parliament for Pendle, echoed these sentiments in his representation.

3.57 We received many representations in support of the proposed Accrington constituency, such as those from Councillor Jeffrey Scales (BCE-19290), James Cheverton (BCE-24413) and Megan McCann (BCE-18686). Many of these representations also supported the constituency name, such as Abdul Khan (BCE-19324) who remarked: ‘I feel that the Accrington name has its history and heritage and the constituency

name which includes Accrington will be more acceptable to the people living in Accrington and its surrounding districts.’ Several other representations, while in support of the configuration of the constituency, did not support the name ‘Accrington’. The Borough of Hyndburn Council (BCE-30834) considered that the name ‘wouldn’t reflect the main population centres in the area.’ Warren Melia (BCE-26453) expressed a wish for the constituency to retain the name Hyndburn. In his representation, the Member of Parliament for Hyndburn, Graham Jones MP (BCE-33470), expressed his support for the initial proposals but commented that: ‘The one anomaly in the Accrington and Padiham seat is the Burnley ward of Coalclough with Deerplay. It does not sit well in the new seat. It will be difficult for people in Coalclough with Deerplay to get to Accrington. It is Burnley and therefore it places an extra civic demand on an MP. It is not connected directly by road to the rest of Accrington. Rosegrove with Lowerhouse is far better connected. Rosegrove has a rail station three stops from Accrington station as well as direct buses along Accrington Road. Lowerhouse is on the edge of Padiham and provides for a better constituency.’

3.58 We noted that representations were received both in support and opposition to the initial proposals in respect of the Burnley constituency. Many constituents in the town of Nelson objected to the proposals, preferring to remain in a Pendle constituency, such as Councillor Hassan Mahmood (BCE-22223) who described the division of the Pendle constituency as ‘wrong’.

3.59 Other respondents, such as Burnley Borough Council (BCE-24228), stated in their representation that ‘the 2016 proposals are a significant improvement on those put forward in 2012. Whilst it would have been clearly preferable to retain the current coterminous boundary between the district council and the Parliamentary constituency, the 2016 proposals do at least keep the main towns of Burnley and Padiham largely intact.’ Julie Cooper, the Member of Parliament for Burnley (BCE-18884), expressed regret that the constituency was being altered but commented that ‘The proposal keeps the towns of Nelson, Colne, Accrington and Blackburn intact and only one ward in the town of Burnley is excluded from the new constituency of Burnley.’

3.60 Some representations opposed the division of Bamber Bridge, noting that, while the Bamber Bridge East ward was included in the proposed Clitheroe and Colne constituency, the Bamber Bridge West ward was proposed to be transferred to the South Ribble constituency. Respondents such as Jonathan Stansby (BCE-16857) and Jack Robinson (BCE-18665) proposed the transfer of Bamber Bridge East ward into the South Ribble constituency, as doing so would leave both constituencies still within the permitted electorate range. Others, such as Rob Kinnon-Brett (BCE-19137 and BCE-33648), suggest that in addition to the transfer of Bamber Bridge East to South Ribble constituency, that the Walton-le-Dale East ward should be transferred to Clitheroe and Colne.

3.61 Our assistant commissioners investigated the counter-proposals that had been put forward. Many counter-proposals for the Ribble Valley constituency, including that of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), Terry Largan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907) and one configuration submitted by Aaron Fear (BCE-31190), suggested that the entirety of the Ribble Valley Borough area should be contained within a single constituency and should be joined with several wards from the Hyndburn Borough (with differing wards from this district proposed to join the constituency in each counter-proposal) in a Ribble Valley and Hyndburn West constituency or, in the case of Aaron Fear, Ribble Valley and Accrington West. We noted that several representations from within Ribble Valley Borough supported the proposals of the Conservative Party, but also that some representations from within Hyndburn Borough objected to any proposal that included it in a constituency with Ribble Valley.

3.62 As part of their investigations, our assistant commissioners noted that many of the counter-proposals suggested a constituency that contains the whole of Pendle Borough in a single constituency with the transfer of either two or three wards from Burnley Borough into the constituency. While our assistant commissioners appreciated that these proposed constituencies would be popular locally, they considered that this pattern of constituencies would require consequential changes to constituencies across the county, including modifications to the proposed constituencies of Lancaster and Morecambe, North Lancashire, Preston, and Accrington.

3.63 Our assistant commissioners noted the submissions that had objected to the configuration of the proposed Clitheroe and Colne constituency, many of which commented that it was not possible to travel easily across the constituency. In light of representations received the assistant commissioners visited the area. Beginning in Preston town centre, and primarily using the A59 to travel through the constituency, our assistant commissioners observed that many of the towns that lie within the proposed constituency had a similar feel, including Barnoldswick and Colne, which are part of the Pendle local authority area. They also observed that, while it is not possible to traverse the whole constituency on major trunk roads without exiting into the proposed North Lancashire constituency, they did not consider this an issue with alternative routes available around Pendle Hill.

3.64 Our assistant commissioners did consider that persuasive evidence had been received to unite the Bamber Bridge area in the South Ribble constituency. They noted that the Bamber Bridge East ward can be transferred to the South Ribble constituency (thus uniting the area in a single constituency) without consequent changes being required elsewhere. They recommended this modification be included in our revised proposals, and we agreed with them. They also suggested that the proposed Clitheroe and Colne constituency would be more appropriately named Pendle and Ribble Valley due to the constituency containing numerous wards from both local authorities. We agree with this suggestion.

3.65 In light of the evidence provided regarding the access of constituents within the Coal Clough with Deerplay ward to the rest of the Accrington constituency, our assistant commissioners investigated the counter-proposals received. They were persuaded by the argument that the Rosegrove with Lowerhouse ward has superior community links to the constituency and agreed with the view that residents within the Coal Clough with Deerplay ward would look more to Burnley for its services. Therefore, they suggested that these two wards be exchanged between the Accrington and Burnley constituencies. They further considered that the evidence of the representations supported the view that the name Accrington would effectively represent the constituency, and have suggested that this remain unchanged. Therefore, they recommended to us revised boundaries for the constituencies of Accrington and Burnley. Having considered the evidence we agree with the recommendation of our assistant commissioners.

3.66 We noted that relatively few representations were received in reference to the proposed constituencies of Preston, Blackburn, and Rossendale and Darwen, with most representations broadly in support of the initial proposals.

3.67 The initial proposals for the Blackburn constituency, which was altered by the inclusion of a single ward, was supported by the political parties and by other respondents such as Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council (BCE-30983) and by Ewood Community Association (BCE-20294). As this constituency was mainly supported, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that

it should remain unchanged, and we concurred. Similarly, the initial proposal for Rossendale and Darwen was broadly supported, including by the political parties who submitted a response to the consultation. Rossendale Borough Council (BCE-26416) commended the proposals as ‘wholly acceptable’ and remarked that the council’s cross-party Consultation Working Group ‘fully support the proposals for Rossendale as it will make greater common sense to the community.’ As such we accept the assistant commissioners’ recommendation for the retention of the initial proposal for this constituency.

3.68 Our assistant commissioners highlighted support for the Preston constituency in the representations from Sam Charlton (BCE-17222) who described the inclusion of the Fulwood area in the constituency as ‘an entirely logical and acceptable addition to the constituency’, and from Maureen Robinson (BCE-16001) who stated: ‘I am pleased to see the proposals end the current artificial inclusion of parts of North Preston into the Wyre constituency. Their inclusion into the Preston constituency reflects their more natural community affinities and provides an opportunity to present a more cohesive view of the needs of the city.’ We noted that proposals that do not support our pattern of constituencies in the north of Lancashire link the Fulwood area to Lancaster as part of a reconfiguration of constituencies elsewhere in the county. As previously outlined earlier in this report, we were not minded to recommend changes to our proposed North Lancashire constituency. Therefore, we propose no changes to our proposed Preston constituency.

3.69 On the Fylde, and in respect of the Blackpool North and Fleetwood, Blackpool South, and Fylde constituencies, we noted that the principal issue of contention in relation to the initial proposals was the division of the town of St. Annes between constituencies. Our suggestion that the St. Leonards and Kilnhouse wards be transferred to a Blackpool South constituency was met with widespread opposition. As well as the division of the community, many respondents remarked that they felt no affinity to Blackpool, and did not share many common interests with their people. Some respondents such as Julia Teanter (BCE-28519) spoke of the physical division between the community of St. Annes and Blackpool due to the presence of Blackpool International Airport. In their representation, Fylde Council (BCE-19349) outlined their opposition to the division of Fylde Borough across constituencies, as did many individual respondents.

3.70 The original counter-proposal of Oliver Raven (BCE-27877) was the same as the initial proposals (aside from the name of the Blackpool South constituency), but with the inclusion of the Kilnhouse ward in the Fylde constituency. As this results in the continued division of St. Annes between constituencies, with one ward being isolated from the remainder of the constituency, our assistant commissioners did not recommend this counter-proposal to us as they considered it did not better reflect the statutory criteria, and we agreed with them. In his second counter-proposal (BCE-39493), Mr Raven includes both wards in a Fylde constituency, but our assistant commissioners considered that

his proposed Carnforth and Garstang, and Fylde constituencies did not better reflect the statutory factors, and did not recommend this counter-proposal to us.

3.71 We received a letter writing campaign (BCE-33226) containing 20 signatories, that proposed an alternative arrangement of constituencies that would result in the Fylde local authority area being wholly contained in a single constituency. We noted that many more individuals also supported this configuration, including Mark Menzies (BCE-30876), the Member of Parliament for Fylde. This proposal would also transfer the two wards of Breck and Carleton into the Blackpool North and Fleetwood constituency, and additionally include the Warbreck ward in the Blackpool South constituency, and was identical to the counter-proposal of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902). As part of their investigations of the counter-proposals, our assistant commissioners noted that, under these proposals, Poulton-le-Fylde would be divided between constituencies.

3.72 In his submission, Terry Largan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907) amended the initial proposals and avoided the division of Poulton-le-Fylde by the inclusion of the Hambleton & Stalmine, and Preesall wards in the Blackpool North and Fleetwood constituency. He also proposed the transfer of the Warbreck ward from the Blackpool North and Fleetwood constituency, which he renamed Blackpool North and Wyre, to the Blackpool South constituency. Terry Largan accepted that the River Wyre forms a physical boundary in the north of his proposed Blackpool

North and Wyre constituency but noted ‘there is a ferry service for visitors and locals between Fleetwood and Knott End, which takes less than 10 minutes; so Over Wyre is not strictly detached.’ The assistant commissioners considered the merits of this counter-proposal, noting that it restores ties in St. Annes, and includes all four Poulton-le-Fylde wards in a single constituency. However, this counter-proposal would require a number of consequential changes to constituencies across Lancashire, including the proposed North Lancashire constituency. Our assistant commissioners did not consider that persuasive evidence had been received to recommend this proposal.

3.73 The counter-proposals of Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972) also united Poulton-le-Fylde into a single constituency. However, in his original submission, he included the two wards of Larches and Ingol (from the existing Preston constituency) in a Fylde constituency and in his alternative configuration, he included the Preston Rural North and Preston Rural East wards (from the existing Wyre and Preston North constituency) in a Fylde constituency. These counter-proposals would also require a number of consequential changes in Lancashire, and the assistant commissioners did not consider persuasive evidence had been received to recommend these proposals.

3.74 After considering the counter-proposals received, our assistant commissioners recommended the counter-proposal submitted in the letter-writing campaign (BCE-33226), which was identical to that of the Conservative

Party. They noted that this would divide the town of Poulton-le-Fylde between constituencies but were persuaded by the evidence illustrating the division of St. Annes, as well as noting the physical division between the Kilnhouse and St. Leonard’s wards and Blackpool, due to the presence of the airport. They noted too that the airport itself is situated in St. Annes parish. We considered that persuasive evidence had been received to support the recommended counter-proposal, particularly in regard to the St. Annes area, despite the fact that we, like the assistant commissioners, were mindful of the impact on the town of Poulton-le-Fylde. We therefore accepted the assistant commissioners’ recommendations for the revised constituencies of Blackpool North and Fleetwood, Blackpool South, and Fylde.

3.75 Aside from the division of the area of Bamber Bridge between constituencies as described earlier in this section, the proposed South Ribble constituency did not elicit substantial representations. Some respondents, such as Dennis Poole (BCE-14270) and Dave Wilson (BCE-19747), welcomed the inclusion of Lostock Hall in the constituency, citing poor links with Ribble Valley. In his representation, Dave Wilson stated: ‘Very pleased that Lostock Hall will return to South Ribble. In this area we have no links at all to the Ribble Valley area. To get to Clitheroe I have to catch two trains or two buses.’ Our assistant commissioners suggested that no further changes are made to this constituency, and we agree with their recommendation.

3.76 We recommended that the Chorley constituency remain unaltered in the initial proposals, and noted very few representations in reference to this constituency. We noted several representations that opposed the inclusion of the Eccleston and Mawdesley ward (from Chorley Borough) in the West Lancashire constituency. Councillor Martin Boardman (BCE-27426) stated that, ‘We believe we have stronger links with our neighbouring villages of Croston, Bretherton, Heskin and Charnock more so than we do with Parbold, Skelmersdale and Burscough.’ This view was supported by others such as Colin Freeman (BCE-18360), and Keith Cranfield (BCE-21224). Other respondents commented on the links between the ward and the Chorley constituency. Stuart Jamieson (BCE-19921) stated: ‘The proposal is to place our village of Eccleston in West Lancs. Talking to friends we know Chorley and its constituency, we know Leyland the main town in South Ribble.’ Martin Fisher (BCE-28141), who submitted a representation on behalf of the Chorley Rural West branch of the South Ribble constituency Labour Party, commented that ‘In the first instance it is submitted that the two wards should be kept in the same constituency as they have already been subject to change at the last review. If it is considered that the rules on the quota of electors precludes this option, then it is submitted that the Eccleston and Mawdesley ward should be placed on the Chorley constituency rather than the west Lancashire constituency.’

3.77 The counter-proposal of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) supported this view, and included the Eccleston and Mawdesley ward in the

South Ribble constituency, noting that the West Lancashire constituency would only contain only wards from West Lancashire Borough, and that Chorley Borough would be divided between only two, rather than three constituencies.

3.78 Our assistant commissioners considered the evidence that had been presented advocating the inclusion of the Eccleston and Mawdesley ward in the South Ribble constituency. They noted that, due to the recommendations to unite the town of Bamber Bridge in the constituency, the addition of the ward in the South Ribble constituency would lead to the electorate being outside the permitted range. They considered that the ward could also be appropriately situated in the Chorley constituency, citing the aforementioned representations that would support this move, and noting that the ward is from Chorley local authority. They considered there to be multiple benefits of the transfer of the ward to the Chorley constituency: first, that the West Lancashire constituency would now be wholly contained within West Lancashire borough; second, that Chorley Borough would now only be divided between two, rather than three, constituencies as in the initial proposals; and third, that there are existing ties with the rest of the Chorley constituency. For these reasons they recommended the transfer of this ward into the constituency, and we agree with them.

3.79 The assistant commissioners did not suggest any further changes to constituencies in Lancashire. The issue of the three West Lancashire Borough wards being included in a cross-county Southport constituency is examined further in the Merseyside section of our report.

Merseyside (less the Wirral)

3.80 Of the eleven constituencies within this sub-region, four have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals, we proposed to reduce the number of constituencies within this sub-region by one, down to 10, due to its entitlement to 9.94 constituencies, and retained unchanged the four constituencies currently within the permitted electorate range: Knowsley, Garston and Halewood, St. Helens South and Whiston, and St. Helens North.

3.81 Elsewhere in Merseyside, we proposed that the Liverpool Wavertree, Liverpool West Derby, and Liverpool Riverside constituencies should undergo minor alterations to bring these constituencies to within 5% of the electoral quota.

3.82 We then suggested crossing the Merseyside and Lancashire county boundary by incorporating into the proposed Southport constituency the three West Lancashire Borough wards of North Meols, Hesketh-with-Becconsall, and Tarleton, thereby allowing the town of Formby to remain undivided and allowing for more of the town of Crosby to be contained within the reconfigured Sefton Central constituency.

3.83 The initial proposals for the Merseyside sub-region were supported in full by the Labour Party, the Conservative Party, and the Liberal Democrat Party. Our assistant commissioners recognised that the Merseyside sub-region initial proposals generated only a relatively

small number of representations and few counter-proposals. They also noted some representations expressed objections to the principle of the review, rather than to specific proposals.

3.84 In the four unchanged constituencies of Knowsley, Garston and Halewood, St. Helens South and Whiston, and St. Helens North, representations largely welcomed the retention of their current composition; for example, Robert Sawle (BCE-23010) and John Sheffield (BCE-21765) both supported these proposals. However, some respondents did express concerns at the continued division of the town of Prescott between the Knowsley, and St. Helen's South and Whiston constituencies. By way of example, Danielle Mulvaney (BCE-15205) commented: 'I feel strongly that the wards of Whiston and Prescott should not be split up into two different voting constituencies as it ignores the reality of the situation on the ground.' This position was echoed by Mark Burke (BCE-24638) who remarked: 'Why would a town be split right down its centre. It makes no sense. Prescott must not be split.'

3.85 Few representations were received in reference to the Liverpool Riverside, Liverpool West Derby, and Liverpool Wavertree constituencies. We noted support for the initial proposals from respondents such as Mark Cotterell (BCE-27673), and Joseph Fitzpatrick (BCE-17906). Stephanie Pitchers (BCE-33972), Tom Crone (BCE-27366) and Councillor Lawrence Brown (BCE-27339) did object to the transfer of the Greenbank ward from Liverpool Riverside to Liverpool Wavertree. However, other respondents

such as Joseph Fitzpatrick (BCE-17906) argued that the ‘expansion of Wavertree at the expense of Riverside makes no tangible difference’ to residents of Greenbank ward. Having considered the issue, the assistant commissioners did not consider the objections compelling enough to modify the initial proposals. We agreed with them.

3.86 Our assistant commissioners noted that the cross-county Southport constituency was largely supported, including by the Labour, Liberal Democrat, and Conservative parties, and also by members of the public such as David Raynor (BCE-19856), Lorraine Cole (BCE-16305) and David Jones (BCE-22518). Mr Jones noted that the three Lancashire wards looked more to Southport than Preston, and that many people within these parishes ‘regard Southport as their local town.’ Harry Bliss (BCE-18157), a Councillor for Cambridge ward, supported the proposals having observed that extending the constituency southwards could lead to Formby being divided across two constituencies, and extending eastwards would lead to unnecessary changes in West Lancashire. There was some opposition to the proposals, namely from residents living within the three West Lancashire Borough wards, such as Gill Corcoran (BCE-20225) and Nigel Lewis (BCE-24186). They considered that the rural communities of the Lancashire wards had different needs to the town of Southport, and were also uneasy about belonging to a constituency divided between two local authorities. The assistant commissioners noted that there were configurations, such as the one proposed by Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972), that did not cross the county boundary with

Lancashire, and would result in the constituency being formed of only one local authority. However, this resulted in the issues highlighted by Councillor Bliss, which were the division of Formby and a mass reconfiguration of constituencies in Lancashire. Our assistant commissioners therefore recommended to us that this counter-proposal should not be adopted.

3.87 There was some concern over the proposal to redistribute the wards of the historic Liverpool, Walton constituency. David Spriggs (BCE-20817) said that ‘the breakup of Liverpool, Walton will be one of the biggest mistakes and a devastating blow to all in Liverpool, Walton and its wards’. Most of the objection was centred on the redistribution of Liverpool, Walton’s wards into neighbouring constituencies outside of the city boundaries, in particular the Bootle constituency. Zoe O’Brien (BCE-18394), Clare Wilkinson (BCE-18001) and Elaine O’Callaghan (BCE-17992) all opposed the transfer of the ward from Liverpool, Walton to Bootle. Ms O’Callaghan felt that Liverpool, Walton would lose its identity under the proposed boundary changes and argued that the constituency is ‘almost totally residential which makes it different to Bootle which encompasses the dock area thus having different needs.’ The assistant commissioners noted this concern but also observed that, considered alone, the proposed Bootle and Sefton Central constituencies drew a limited response. Given that Merseyside has to lose a constituency, the assistant commissioners were insufficiently swayed by the arguments to preserve the existing Liverpool, Walton constituency.

3.88 In light of the support for the initial proposals, assistant commissioners recommended that the initial proposals for all 10 constituencies should be unchanged. They considered that the counter-proposals received would result in dividing communities and changes to existing constituencies which could otherwise be unchanged. They considered that persuasive evidence had been received in support of the initial proposals. We agree with the recommendation from the assistant commissioners and have decided not to modify the initial proposals in the Merseyside sub-region.

Greater Manchester, Wirral, and Cheshire

Greater Manchester

3.89 Of the 27 existing constituencies within Greater Manchester, 11 have electorates that are currently within the permitted electorate range.

3.90 Since the electorates of many constituencies in the western and central Greater Manchester areas were within the permitted electorate range, in our initial proposals we sought to retain as many of these constituencies unchanged as possible. This resulted in the Wigan, Makerfield, Leigh, Worsley and Eccles South, Salford and Eccles, Blackley and Broughton, Manchester Gorton, Manchester Withington, and Wythenshawe and Sale East constituencies being wholly unchanged. The constituency of Manchester Central was amended only by the necessary removal of a single ward (Moston).

3.91 We further proposed that the Bucklow-St. Martin's ward, from the existing Stretford and Urmston constituency, should be included in our Altrincham and Tatton Park constituency, which crossed the county boundary between Greater Manchester and Cheshire. As a result of changes elsewhere, we recommended that the two western Sale town wards of Ashton upon Mersey and St. Mary's should be included in the Stretford and Urmston constituency.

3.92 Under our initial proposals we suggested more significant changes to the constituencies within the boroughs of Bolton and Bury. We included the Halliwell ward in a Bolton West constituency, and the Rumworth and Great Lever wards in a Bolton North East constituency, in order to increase the electorates of both constituencies to within the permitted electorate range. We proposed that the existing Bury North constituency, which required an increase in electors, would include the Radcliffe East ward, and suggested that, as a result of changes elsewhere, it would be more appropriate to name this constituency Bury. This led us to create a new constituency called Farnworth, comprising five Borough of Bolton wards and three Borough of Bury wards.

3.93 We noted that the electorates of both the existing Heywood and Middleton (75,880) and Rochdale (72,530) constituencies were within the permitted electorate range, but we recommended changes to these constituencies in order to accommodate changes elsewhere. We proposed a Prestwich and Middleton constituency that contained five wards

each from the boroughs of Rochdale and Bury. We considered that this configuration allowed the towns of Prestwich and Middleton to be undivided. We proposed that the Rochdale constituency should be reconfigured, so that it included the whole of the town centre (which is currently divided between constituencies), and most of the town of Heywood.

3.94 In our initial proposals, we suggested that a new, moor-based constituency called Littleborough and Saddleworth should be formed from the rural areas of the east of the boroughs of Oldham and Rochdale, drawing five wards from each. We also suggested an Oldham constituency containing much of the town in a single compact, urban constituency, which also included the ward of Moston from the existing Manchester Central constituency. Further south from Oldham, we proposed a Failsworth and Droylsden constituency that contained wards from four existing constituencies, but from only two local authorities. We acknowledged the irregular shape of this constituency, but felt that other configurations would not better reflect the statutory factors. The Ashton-under-Lyne constituency, which was reconfigured to extend eastwards in our initial proposals, included the towns of Stalybridge and Mossley.

3.95 We recommended that the Marple and Hyde constituency should include wards from the Borough of Stockport and the Borough of Tameside, and noted that the A560 provided a link across the two boroughs. We suggested that the core of the existing Denton and Reddish constituency should be included in a Stockport North and Denton

constituency, and that in the south, Cheadle Hulme and Cheadle would remain together in a new Stockport South and Cheadle constituency.

3.96 The reduction in the number of constituencies and the entitlements to constituencies in both Greater Manchester (25.37) and Cheshire (10.34) meant that it was necessary to cross the county boundary to create acceptable constituencies, and we recommended that this be done in two areas. Firstly, in the southern part of Stockport, five wards including the towns of Bramhall and Hazel Grove would be included in a constituency with wards from the existing Macclesfield and Tatton constituencies in Cheshire, embracing the towns of Poynton, Disley and Handforth. We suggested that this constituency should be called Bramhall and Poynton. The second proposed cross-county constituency, Altrincham and Tatton Park, will be examined in further detail later in this report.

3.97 Our assistant commissioners considered that there were competing approaches to the creation of constituencies in Greater Manchester. Some respondents considered that many existing constituencies could be largely unchanged, and modifications could be made elsewhere in areas where many constituencies did not meet the electorate requirements. Conversely, some respondents considered that those constituencies which did not require change could be modified, so that those constituencies outside the permitted electorate range could be changed to a lesser degree. In assessing the counter-proposals received, assistant

commissioners considered that changes to constituencies should primarily occur where the need arises due to the electorate falling outside the permitted range, and have kept this in mind when considering their revised proposal recommendations.

3.98 In response to the consultation on the initial proposals, the Labour Party (BCE-40903) supported the initial proposals for Greater Manchester in full. However, they did note that ties had been broken in some areas such as in Royton, and encouraged the Commission to consider modifications that could restore these ties without adopting wholesale changes across the county.

3.99 The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) did not submit counter-proposals for any constituencies within Greater Manchester, but expressed concerns about the parish of Saddleworth being divided between constituencies. They also commented that ‘the proposals around the north east of Greater Manchester are not ideal.’ They noted, however, that this configuration allowed for a ‘sensible’ distribution of seats across the remainder of the county.

3.100 The Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) supported the constituencies of Ashton-under-Lyne, Leigh, Makerfield, Manchester Withington, Marple and Hyde, Wigan, Worsley and Eccles South, and Wythenshawe and Sale East. They submitted counter-proposals for all of the remaining constituencies in Greater Manchester.

3.101 The North West Green Party (BCE-29032) proposed some modifications to constituencies in the Stockport area on day one of the Manchester public hearing. This however was subsequently withdrawn and, in their final submission to the consultation on the initial proposals, the Green Party supported the initial proposals in full.

3.102 Our proposals for unchanged constituencies for Wigan, Makerfield, Leigh, and Worsley and Eccles South did not generate many representations, with respondents largely supporting these constituencies, for example that from Yvonne Fovargue (BCE-24032), the Member of Parliament for Makerfield, who supported the constituencies of Leigh, Makerfield, and Wigan.

3.103 In the Borough of Bolton, representations were received that expressed both support and opposition to our initial proposals. The Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) submitted a counter-proposal that recreated the Bolton South East constituency, including the Atherton ward (from Wigan Borough) that we had proposed be included in a Bolton West constituency. Under their proposal, the reconfigured Bolton West constituency would instead include the Astley Bridge ward from the existing Bolton North East, while the Bolton South East constituency would contain the Great Lever and Rumworth wards due to their ‘close ties to Hulton, Harper Green and Farnworth.’

3.104 The Member of Parliament for Bolton North East, Sir David Crausby, (BCE-27153) supported the initial proposals for Bolton, and disagreed with the counter-proposals put forward by the Conservative Party, commenting that: ‘the only choice to bring Bolton West to the right size is to add Halliwell ward. This ward has previously been a part of Bolton West, and had good transport links with the rest constituency, sharing Chorley Old Road, and Chorley New Road.’

3.105 Other representations also disagreed with the assertions of the Conservative Party proposal, such as Julie Hilling, the former Member of Parliament for Bolton West (BCE-32653) who, on day two of the Liverpool public hearing, remarked that: ‘If Atherton has to be an orphan ward, and clearly with the size of Wigan borough there is one ward that has to be orphan and Bolton West has been an orphan ward since 2010, it is better from my opinion to stay with similar towns. Atherton is in with Westhoughton, Horwich, Blackrod, all towns that feel neglected by the big Bolton or the big Wigan. There is similar housing. The communities are sort of terraced housing in the middle, going out to council estates and then getting out to ever larger houses on the outskirts of the towns.’ She went on to say ‘There is no link between the rest of Bolton West and Astley Bridge. In fact, I had to look on a map to see where Astley Bridge actually would be.’ Similar sentiments were also echoed by Anne Connolly (BCE-39552).

3.106 Our proposed Farnworth constituency drew some criticism from respondents. Representations opposed to this constituency focused on the division

of communities in areas such as Radcliffe and Whitefield; for example, Kath Horwill (BCE-18557), and Keith Jump (BCE-34416). Others, such as Yasmin Qureshi, the Member of Parliament for Bolton South East (BCE-32059), opposed the breaking of ties between Rumworth and Great Lever, Harper Green, and Farnworth, stating that the residents of Rumworth and Great Lever ‘have relatives and families who have gone out into Harper Green, Farnworth, Carlton and even parts of Kearsley.’ In her oral representation, Ms Qureshi further stated there was a ‘connection’ between the Tonge and Great Lever wards.

3.107 Andrew Teale (BCE-24940) submitted a representation supporting the inclusion of the towns of Radcliffe and Farnworth in one constituency, but suggested some modifications to the Farnworth, Prestwich and Middleton, and Bury constituencies that would avoid the division of the town of Radcliffe. In his submission, Andrew Teale proposed three alterations to the configurations of constituencies suggested in the initial proposals. He proposed that the Radcliffe East ward, rather than being included in Bury, should be placed in a Radcliffe and Farnworth constituency; that the Pilkington Park ward should be transferred to a Prestwich and Middleton constituency; and finally, that the Unsworth ward should be transferred to a Bury constituency. This counter-proposal resulted in the three constituencies of Radcliffe and Farnworth, Prestwich and Middleton, and Bury with electorates of 72,031, 77,122, and 71,594 respectively, and thus all within the permitted electorate range. This configuration of constituencies was also proposed by

Ian Derek Walsh (BCE-14704) and was supported by Sir David Crausby MP (BCE-37278) in his representation to the secondary consultation.

3.108 Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972) suggested the same configuration of the Farnworth and Bury constituencies (albeit with alternative constituency names), and considered that should we be minded to reject his proposals for a constituency in this area that would cross the borough boundary into Salford, then the Pilkington Park ward could be transferred to Prestwich and Middleton, thereby re-uniting the towns of Radcliffe and Whitefield.

3.109 After carefully assessing the evidence, our assistant commissioners recommended that we retain the initial proposals for the constituencies of Bolton North East and Bolton West, considering that other arrangements for these two constituencies did not better reflect the statutory factors. In view of the division of the town of Radcliffe in the Borough of Bury, our assistant commissioners recommended to us that the counter-proposal of Andrew Teale, which was also submitted by others, should be adopted in order to minimise the splitting of communities. In light of the re-unification of the town of Radcliffe, and as suggested in some representations to recognise the area from Bury Borough that is included in this constituency, the assistant commissioners recommended that the constituency should be called Farnworth and Radcliffe. We accept this recommendation.

3.110 Our assistant commissioners acknowledged that many representations from respondents within the Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council area expressed concerns about being included in a Failsworth and Droylsden constituency with residents from Tameside, to which they felt no connection. Some people such as Philippa Whittaker (BCE-26547), and Peter White (BCE-19218), also commented on the fact that this constituency is divided by the M60 motorway. In addition, under the initial proposals, the town of Royton had been divided between constituencies, and we received several representations declaring opposition to any such proposal, such as from Jenny Webster (BCE-18297), Andy Syddall (BCE-15413), and Andrew Hunter-Rossall (BCE-29260), who provided a representation on behalf of the Oldham and Saddleworth Green Party.

3.111 In the Borough of Rochdale, we received objections to the modification of the Heywood and Middleton, and Rochdale constituencies, which as previously mentioned, were both within the permitted electorate range; for example from Katherine Fish (BCE-22596), Gillian Burton (BCE-17272), Pearl Naylor (BCE-29796), Simon Danczuk, the former MP for Rochdale (BCE-30975), and Rochdale Borough Council (BCE-29504). Many of the respondents proposed that both constituencies should remain unaltered, but did not address how neighbouring constituencies could be modified to bring them within the permitted electorate range.

3.112 Our proposed Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency drew a varied response. We noted that several representations expressed concerns at the combining of the two towns into one constituency, such as that from Gaynor Smith (BCE-19713) who remarked: ‘Putting Littleborough and Saddleworth together is wrong. One has Rochdale council the other has Oldham council. Different needs and expectations from the council when voting.’ There were others such as Ruby Holbrook (BCE-15533) who, in her representation, acknowledged that even though the demographics of Littleborough and Saddleworth were similar, linking the two would create a cross-borough constituency involving two different councils, and an area too large for an MP to effectively represent. We also noted a letter writing campaign with 197 signatories opposing the division of the town of Saddleworth between constituencies, due to the inclusion of the Saddleworth West and Lees ward in the proposed Failsworth and Droylsden constituency (BCE-33231).

3.113 However, we did receive some support for our proposed Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency, such as from Stephen Dawson (BCE-15665) who described the constituency as an ‘excellent’ idea, and from others such as Irene Watts (BCE-16005) and Melvyn Ratcliff (BCE-15057). Neil Allsopp (BCE-32342) welcomed the return of a Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency, but proposed a different configuration. Several respondents who supported the initial proposals did, however, also express concern at the division of the town of Saddleworth, and many put forward

counter-proposals that would transfer the Saddleworth West and Lees ward to the Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency.

3.114 Several respondents, such as Jamie Curley (BCE-19240), Luke Lancaster (BCE-26275), Aaron Rogers (BCE-26299) and others proposed the following modification to the initial proposals: that the Royton North ward be transferred from Littleborough and Saddleworth into Oldham; that the Saddleworth West and Lees ward be transferred from Failsworth and Droylsden to Littleborough and Saddleworth; that the Healey ward be transferred from Rochdale to Littleborough and Saddleworth; and that the Smallbridge and Firgrove ward be transferred from Littleborough and Saddleworth to Rochdale.

3.115 We also received other counter-proposals for the Rochdale Borough area. We received a counter-proposal from Terry Largan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907) that was in many respects similar to that of the initial proposals, but with some alterations. Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council, in its counter-proposal submitted by Councillor Jean Stretton (BCE-30404), sought to create two constituencies wholly within the borough. This proposal was supported by various individuals such as Stephen Lees (BCE-34141), and the principle of which was supported by others such as the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), the Member of Parliament for Oldham East and Saddleworth, Debbie Abrahams (BCE-29169 and BCE-32216), and the Member of Parliament for Oldham West

and Royton, Jim McMahon (BCE-29739, BCE-30395 and BCE-32780). David Heyes, a former Member of Parliament for Ashton-under-Lyne (BCE-32210 and BCE-28641), also put forward a counter-proposal that changed the Borough of Oldham minimally, but this counter-proposal would also require consequential changes to constituencies in Greater Manchester, some of which are currently within the permitted electorate range.

3.116 Our assistant commissioners considered the merits of counter-proposals that suggested this approach but determined that reconfiguring constituencies in this manner would have undesirable effects elsewhere in Greater Manchester and, as such, they did not recommend their adoption. We agreed with this recommendation.

3.117 In addition to lending his support to the proposals from Oldham Council, Jim McMahon MP suggested a 'least worst' alternative for consideration, which was self-contained and could be adopted without affecting neighbouring constituencies. In his counter-proposal, he suggested a three-way amendment to the proposed Littleborough and Saddleworth, Failsworth and Droylsden, and Oldham constituencies that would restore ties that had been broken in the towns of Royton and Saddleworth. Mr McMahon proposed that the Royton North ward should be transferred from the proposed Littleborough and Saddleworth constituency to the Oldham constituency, thus uniting the town of Royton, and that to offset the increase in electorate, that the St. Mary's ward be transferred to Failsworth and Droylsden. Failsworth and

Droylsden would then have an electorate that is too large, so the Saddleworth West and Lees ward could be transferred to Littleborough and Saddleworth, uniting the town of Saddleworth in one constituency. Our assistant commissioners considered that, while any arrangement in Oldham would be unlikely to be wholly satisfactory to all, Mr McMahon's counter-proposal, which reunifies two towns without adversely affecting neighbouring constituencies, demonstrated an improvement on the initial proposals, and recommended that this counter-proposal be included in the revised proposals. We agree with their suggestion.

3.118 Our assistant commissioners noted support for the Ashton-under-Lyne constituency, for example from Andrew Hey (BCE-18160) who said 'I feel that the demographics of the four towns in the constituency (Ashton/Dukinfield/Stalybridge/Mossley) group together quite well', although he suggested a change of name to Tameside North. They also acknowledged that this constituency was supported by all the political parties, and have recommended that we retain the initial proposals for this constituency, with which we agree.

3.119 We noted considerable support, including of a letter writing campaign with 46 signatories, as well as numerous individual written and oral representations for the Stockport North and Denton constituency, such as those from Joanne Muccio (BCE-18207), Fiona Mayer (BCE-18152) and Lynne Lowes (BCE-17902). Our assistant commissioners recommended no changes to the initial proposal for this constituency. We agree with their recommendation.

3.120 In respect of the Stockport South and Cheadle constituency, our assistant commissioners noted the concerns, such as those from Kathryn Young (BCE-17936), and Conrad Beard (BCE-28610), which were raised regarding the two wards of Heatons North and Heatons South being divided between constituencies. Our assistant commissioners also noted the objections of respondents surrounding the proposed Marple and Hyde constituency. Many respondents were concerned that the proposed constituency would contain electors from two different boroughs. Steve Nicklin (BCE-35527) commented ‘Each borough is significantly different from a demographic perspective, receives different funding from the government, has distinctly different issues to deal with and each has its own priorities in respect to spending’, and Brian Smith (BCE-16631) remarked ‘my main concern is one of ‘mixing up’ administrative and council boundaries within a single constituency.’

3.121 Our assistant commissioners were sympathetic to these views, and concurred that the division of Heatons North and Heatons South in separate constituencies was not ideal. However, they outlined to us that any amendments made in this area to our initial proposals would likely have far-reaching adverse effects elsewhere in the sub-region, and have suggested to us that the initial proposals should remain for these two constituencies, and we agreed.

3.122 Bearing in mind their intent to preserve as many constituencies unchanged as possible, and in light of the self-contained solutions to issues they were able to find elsewhere, our assistant commissioners recommended that we maintain the swathe of either wholly or

minimally altered constituencies of Wigan, Makerfield, Leigh, Worsley and Eccles South, Salford and Eccles, Blackley and Broughton, Manchester Gorton, Manchester Withington, and Wythenshawe and Sale East. They noted that several counter-proposals, for example that of the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902), Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972), Terry Largan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907), Oliver Raven (BCE-27877 and BCE-39493) and David Heyes (BCE-28641) alter some of these constituencies in order to resolve issues elsewhere. Due to the knock-on effect these changes have to constituencies in the wider area, they recommended to us that these counter-proposals are not adopted, and we agree with them.

3.123 We noted several objections regarding the Bramhall and Poynton constituency, which crossed the Cheshire and Greater Manchester county boundary. In particular, many respondents from the town of Poynton conveyed their concerns about being included in a cross-county constituency, for example Tim Lilley (BCE-29587), who commented ‘Although we are close to Hazel Grove, we do not have affinity with Stockport, Bramhall or Handforth.’ This sentiment was echoed by others, such as Alvan Ikoku (BCE-28825) who stated ‘Poynton is a Cheshire settlement. Poyntonians’ look towards Cheshire and now Cheshire East for their corporate services’, and Alan Kendrick (BCE-26675) who remarked ‘Poynton is, and always has been, part of Cheshire and has its own unique identity, completely separate from the urban sprawl of Manchester.’ Some representations however did express support for the initial proposals, such as

from David Capener (BCE-26916) and Anna Rapotu (BCE-29376). The Conservative Party (BCE-40902), who had proposed a variation on the initial proposal for Bramhall and Poynton, acknowledged the opposition in Poynton to proposals to link the two areas, but remarked ‘we have not seen a satisfactory alternative for these wards.’

3.124 In response to the initial proposals, several representations objected to the division of the towns of Wilmslow and Handforth. We noted the representation from Wilmslow Town Council (BCE-26318), who indicated in their submission that, while they would prefer the town to be located in a constituency wholly within Cheshire, they would accept a proposal that keeps the town united in a single constituency. This view was also reflected by Cheshire East Council, who in their representation (BCE-27025) stated that: ‘Cheshire East Council wishes to express in the strongest terms the importance of Wilmslow Town and its surrounding villages (which have a shared strong sense of shared community identity and local ties) not being separated by constituency boundaries under any new arrangements.’ Members of the public, such as Thomas Buckby (BCE-24100) and Angela Ferguson (BCE-20418), echoed these sentiments.

3.125 Our assistant commissioners examined the evidence that had been presented to them and, after some deliberation, considered that the constituency that crosses the county boundary between Cheshire East and the Metropolitan Borough of Stockport could be improved. They noted significant opposition to our proposed Bramhall and Poynton constituency from residents of the three Cheshire East wards covering Disley

and Poynton, which are rural in character, and felt that being in a constituency with urban Greater Manchester wards would lead to their needs not being represented. They acknowledged too the opposition to the division of Wilmslow and Handforth between constituencies. In considering these objections the assistant commissioners identified a pattern of constituencies which would allow the Wilmslow area to be united in a single constituency, by including the Handforth and Wilmslow Dean Row wards, whilst simultaneously allowing the three wards containing the towns of Poynton and Disley to remain in Macclesfield – their current constituency. In addition to the aforementioned changes, they recommend that the remainder of the Bramhall and Poynton constituency wards as proposed in the initial proposals should be joined with the wards of Alderley Edge, Wilmslow East, Wilmslow Lacey Green, and Wilmslow West and Chorley, thus uniting Handforth and Wilmslow in a single constituency. Due to its configuration, they suggest that this new constituency is named Hazel Grove and Wilmslow. We acknowledge that this configuration had not been suggested in any counter-proposals and therefore invite and welcome comment on the suitability of this constituency. The assistant commissioners noted that the Conservative Party (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) included these same six Cheshire wards in a cross-border constituency, albeit that those wards were combined with a different set of Stockport Borough wards, centred on Cheadle.

Wirral

3.126 Of the four existing constituencies in the Wirral, none are within the permitted electorate range. Under our initial proposals the number of constituencies in the Wirral was reduced by one to give the sub-region a total of three constituencies.

3.127 Two of the existing constituencies, Wallasey and Birkenhead, underwent minor changes, largely maintaining their current boundaries and gaining a ward each; the other two saw much more significant change. The existing constituencies of Wirral West and Wirral South were merged to create a Bebington and Heswall constituency, almost doubling the size of the constituency in geographic terms. Our initial proposals also proposed the inclusion of the Borough of Wirral ward of Eastham in our Ellesmere Port and Neston constituency, a mainly Cheshire constituency.

3.128 Our initial proposals for the Wirral were met with a large degree of support, but also some opposition. The Conservative Party (BCE-33246), Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) and the majority of representations supported the configuration set out in the initial proposals. The counter-proposals we did receive were relatively limited in scope and suggested only minor changes to the overall configuration.

3.129 Most of the opposition centred around our proposed Bebington and Heswall constituency, with the vast majority of representations objecting to the proposed name of the constituency. Many considered that the proposed name did not accurately reference the composition

of the constituency. The Labour Party (BCE-40903) described the exclusion of Bebington ward as a ‘serious anomaly’ and, along with the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrats, cited this as their main point of contention for proposals concerning the Wirral. In formulating our initial proposals, we recognised that excluding Bebington ward from Bebington and Heswall could prove to be an issue and noted in our initial proposals report that alternative suggestions for the name of the constituency were welcome.

3.130 Various suggestions were put forward for a more appropriate title, with many of them including the word ‘Wirral’ in some form. Mary Catherine Scott (BCE-18328) considered that the current name ‘only represented half of the current constituency and ignores the Deeside towns of Meols, Hoylake and West Kirby.’ To this end she suggested ‘something more inclusive’ such as West Wirral. This was popular with many including Michael Collins (BCE-34518) who supported our initial proposals but had similar reservations to Ms Scott. Other popular suggestions put forward were Wirral South, Wirral West and South, Wirral Deeside, and Deeside and Bromborough.

3.131 The Labour Party (BCE-31193) took the view that the configuration of the constituency should also change and suggested a counter-proposal which transferred Bebington ward to Bebington and Heswall, Upton ward to Birkenhead and included Hoylake and Meols ward in the Wallasey constituency. In doing this they recognised that a small part of West Kirby, included in the Hoylake and Meols ward, would be split from the rest of West Kirby but deemed it to be a better

outcome than having Bebington ward outside of Bebington and Heswall. Alison McGovern, the Member of Parliament for Wirral South (BCE-32680 and BCE-30891), pressed strongly for the initial proposals to be reconfigured to maintain the town of Bebington intact and indeed to maintain wider community links with Bromborough, New Ferry, Spital and Eastham. A few representations from residents of the Bebington and Upton wards supported the move suggested by the Labour Party. Steven Quinn (BCE-17271), a resident of Upton, was strongly opposed to being part of the Wallasey constituency, as set out in our initial proposals, and described Upton as being ‘a suburb of Birkenhead.’ Representations from Jonathan Stansby (BCE-16858), Mary Taylor (BCE-16975) and Gillian Hargreaves (BCE-20279) also cited poor links with Wallasey as reasons why Upton should be included with Birkenhead in a constituency. In Bebington ward, Keith Bidwell (BCE-17503) and Neil Gates (BCE-19429) both supported moving Bebington from the constituency of Birkenhead to Bebington and Heswall. However, there was significant opposition to including the Hoylake and Meols ward in the Wallasey constituency due to concerns over West Kirby being split. In her representation the Member of Parliament for Wirral West, Margaret Greenwood (BCE-30204 and BCE-32622), argued that ‘It would make no sense to split West Kirby in two’ and that ‘There are strong cultural ties between West Kirby, Hoylake and Meols.’ This view was shared by residents of Hoylake and Meols ward, such as Linda Platt (BCE-28898) and Hilary Catherall (BCE-18052), who stated that West Kirby had no connection with Moreton or Wallasey, and by the former Member of Parliament for Wirral West, Esther McVey (BCE-22574).

3.132 In their assessment of the Labour Party counter-proposal the assistant commissioners noted that there was an opposing argument which supported Upton moving into Wallasey. In her representation, Councillor Wendy Clements (BCE-20706) noted that Upton ward is currently in the Wirral West constituency, has clear and easy links with the proposed Wallasey constituency via Moreton West and Saughall Massie, and Moreton East and Leasowe wards, and is separated from the rest of the Birkenhead constituency by the M53 Motorway. Others, such as Councillor Stuart Kelly (BCE-24683), noted that ‘it might have been possible to add Upton to Birkenhead but this would have meant that Hoylake would have had to have joined with Wallasey.’ Hoylake and Meols ward is currently in the same constituency as the West Kirby and Thurstaston ward and the dividing line between the two wards runs straight through the town. A councillor for West Kirby and Thurstaston ward, Jeff Green (BCE-27187), argued that the communities of West Kirby and Hoylake are ‘intrinsically linked’ with the majority of West Kirby town centre included within Hoylake and Meols ward. Councillor Green did not consider that the residents of Hoylake and Meols ward have any connection to the Wallasey constituency. In the interest of preserving local ties, and changing as little as possible, the assistant commissioners considered that the Labour counter-proposal was too radical, especially as there were schemes that addressed the concerns over Bebington and Heswall with far less disruption.

3.133 Another large point of contention in the Wirral was the proposal to cross the county boundary between the Wirral and Cheshire. Such a move was necessary in order to ensure that the Wirral constituencies were within 5% of the electoral quota and, of the options available, we considered that moving Eastham ward into Ellesmere Port and Neston was the best place to do this. Representations from Mark Ashley (BCE-15365), Colin Matthews (BCE-15053) and Dara Morad (BCE-23778) all argued that, as a part of the Wirral, Eastham ward should be represented by a Wirral MP. The assistant commissioners recognised that there were strong objections to our proposal from residents of Eastham ward but did not consider that any persuasive counter-proposals were received which allowed the Eastham ward to be included in a Wirral constituency. The assistant commissioners were minded therefore to recommend that Eastham ward should remain in the Ellesmere Port and Neston constituency, as set out in our initial proposals. We agree with their recommendation.

3.134 In light of the many representations received, the assistant commissioners recommended two amendments to the initial proposals for the Wirral. They agreed with the concerns over the composition of the proposed Bebington and Heswall constituency. Rather than simply renaming the constituency, the assistant commissioners recommended that the Bebington ward should be included in the Bebington and Heswall constituency and that Bromborough ward be transferred from the proposed Bebington and Heswall constituency into Birkenhead. The assistant commissioners believed this was

a much simpler solution to the problem than counter-proposals put forward by the Labour Party or individuals such as Colin Smith (BCE-21205), although they recognised that it was still not possible to maintain the close affinity between Bebington and Bromborough communities within a single constituency. We accept their recommendation.

Cheshire

3.135 Of the 11 existing constituencies within Cheshire, two have electorates that are currently within 5% of the electoral quota. Under our initial proposals, we proposed to reduce the number of constituencies within this sub-region from 11 to 10 due to its entitlement to 10.34 constituencies.

3.136 In our initial proposals, we suggested that three constituencies could remain largely unchanged, apart from a realignment to ensure they reflected changes to local government ward boundaries. Crewe and Nantwich, and Congleton already had electorates within the permitted electorate range and the City of Chester came into range once the entirety of Chester Villages ward, which is currently divided between constituencies, was included in the proposed constituency.

3.137 Many Cheshire constituencies only required the transfer of a single ward to bring them into the permitted electorate range. Ellesmere Port and Neston was also adjusted to reflect local government changes but, unlike the three unchanged constituencies, this was not sufficient to bring the electorate within the permitted electorate range. We therefore proposed that the Borough of Wirral ward of Eastham

be included in this constituency, which we considered to be part of the urban continuum between Bebington and Ellesmere Port. Our consideration on this in light of representations received is detailed above.

3.138 In the Borough of Halton, we noted that the current electorate figure for the Halton constituency was very close to the minimum required; the addition of a single ward, Halton Lea, brought the number of electors within range. Finally, we recognised that the Warrington constituencies could be contained wholly within their local authority area, and proposed a single ward change, Latchford East, to be transferred from Warrington South to Warrington North, in order to bring both constituencies into the permitted electorate range.

3.139 The reduction in constituencies, and the need for us to cross the Greater Manchester and Cheshire county boundary, led to significant changes for the remaining constituencies. In Weaver Vale we proposed a configuration that led to the constituency extending considerably further south, to the border with Wales. Halton Lea ward and the wards containing the town of Northwich were no longer included in the Weaver Vale constituency. To compensate for this loss, the constituency would then gain Marbury ward, from the existing Tatton constituency, and wards from the existing Eddisbury constituency, including Farndon and Gowy. In return, Eddisbury included the Northwich wards, and was renamed to Eddisbury and Northwich to reflect this. In addition to the town of Northwich, Eddisbury also included the Shakerley, and Witton and Rudheath, wards from

the existing Tatton constituency to form a constituency that extended further north.

3.140 On the border of Greater Manchester we proposed two constituencies that crossed the Greater Manchester and Cheshire county boundary: Bramhall and Poynton, and Altrincham and Tatton Park. The existing Macclesfield constituency would no longer include the areas in the north, around Poynton and Disley, but instead extend to the north-west to include the area around Wilmslow and Alderley Edge, as well as the Chelford ward from the existing Tatton constituency. The remaining Tatton wards of High Legh, Knutsford, and Mobberley, would then be included in a new cross-border constituency with eight Borough of Trafford wards, including the town of Altrincham.

3.141 In Cheshire, the reaction to our initial proposals was mixed. There was support for the constituencies bordering Merseyside as, on the whole, these underwent less change. These constituencies included Halton, Warrington North, and Warrington South. Crewe and Nantwich, and Congleton, in Cheshire East, were also generally supported.

3.142 The initial proposals for the Halton constituency which, with the exception of the addition of the Halton Lea ward, is otherwise unchanged, did not attract many representations. In their submission, the Labour Party (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) suggested that the Beechwood ward, rather than Halton Lea (as suggested in the initial proposals), was the more appropriate ward to be transferred into the constituency. We noted there was support for the inclusion of Halton Lea in a Halton constituency,

such as from the Conservative Party (BCE-40902) who stated that: 'Any examination of a map would suggest the appropriate ward to move into Halton was Halton Lea with its ties to the Grange, Halton Brook, and Halton Castle wards.' Our assistant commissioners also noted support for the initial proposals for Halton from Shelagh Kearney (BCE-17003), and the former Member of Parliament for Weaver Vale, Graham Evans (BCE-26958), who pointed out that the ward of Halton Lea contained Runcorn Shopping City, and Halton's general hospital. Our assistant commissioners indicated to us that they did not feel alternative arrangements for the Halton constituency, such as the suggestion that the Windmill Hill ward should be added to the existing constituency as in some counter-proposals, better reflected the statutory factors, as they noted that the town park forms a physical barrier not present in the Halton Lea ward. As such, they have recommended that the initial proposal for Halton remain unaltered. They were, however, persuaded by the suggestion of Edward Keene (BCE-33174) that the constituency would be more appropriately titled Widnes and Runcorn, to give recognition to the two towns contained within it, and because there are wards from the district of Halton that are not included in the constituency. We also recommend this name.

3.143 Our assistant commissioners noted support for the initial proposals in reference to the Warrington North and Warrington South constituencies in representations from those such as Ian Simpson (BCE-18816), and Stephen Taylor (BCE-22910). We noted the representations of the Member of Parliament for Warrington

North, Helen Jones (BCE-27114), who in her representation to the initial consultation suggested that the Bewsey and Whitecross ward may be more suitable to transfer to the Warrington North constituency, and asked the Commission to carefully consider the evidence when making their decision. Our assistant commissioners reflected on whether the Bewsey and Whitecross or Latchford East ward would be more appropriately situated in Warrington North and concluded that transferring the Bewsey and Whitecross ward into Warrington North would cause the Penketh and Cuerdley, Great Sankey North, Great Sankey South, and Whittle Hall wards to become detached from the remainder of the constituency. They have therefore suggested to us that the initial proposals should remain unchanged. We agree with their recommendation.

3.144 The proposed City of Chester constituency elicited almost unanimous support. Representations such as those from William Pattison (BCE-25718), Alex Guanaria (BCE-27320) and Emily Pimm (BCE-23077) demonstrated a large degree of support for the initial proposals, especially the proposal to include the villages of Mickle Trafford, Bridge Trafford, Picton, Rowton and Waverton within the constituency. Support for the initial proposals was also evident in representations from people such as Tim Hulse (BCE-30029) and Andrew Ramsey (BCE-24000), who favoured our initial proposal and called on the Commission to reject a Labour Party counter-proposal which would transfer the Dodleston and Huntington ward from the proposed City of Chester constituency to an Eddisbury constituency.

3.145 Opposition to the initial proposals was much stronger in the areas affected by the redistribution of wards from the existing Tatton constituency, and those bordering Greater Manchester, namely Weaver Vale, Eddisbury and Northwich, Macclesfield, and Altrincham and Tatton Park. We received numerous counter-proposals recommending changes to these areas.

3.146 The Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat Parties submitted similar counter-proposals for the constituencies of Weaver Vale and Eddisbury and sought to minimise change and tackle what they perceived to be a division, within our initial proposals, between the urban north and rural south. The Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) suggested that the initial proposal for Weaver Vale was flawed because ‘the centres of population ... are all located in the northern part of the proposed seat, whereas the southern rural wards are geographically some distance away from the population centres and would suffer from being isolated.’ The Labour Party (BCE-31193) also commented on this issue suggesting that urban areas of Runcorn had little in common with the rural south of Cheshire. They also raised the point that such a radical reconfiguration would result in only ‘61.0% of the electors of Eddisbury CC and 58.3% of the electors of Weaver Vale CC’ remaining in the same constituency.

3.147 To solve this, the Liberal Democrat (BCE-29373), Labour (BCE-31193 and BCE-40903) and Conservative (BCE-33246 and BCE-40902) parties all submitted counter-proposals which they suggested kept the rural southern wards within an Eddisbury constituency. The Labour and

Liberal Democrat parties proposed that the more northern wards of Hartford and Greenbank, Weaver and Cuddington, Winnington and Castle, and Witton and Rudheath should be located in the Weaver Vale constituency, and that the wards of Farndon, Tarporley, and Tattenhall be located in the Eddisbury constituency. The Conservative Party proposals were not dissimilar, but they included the Winnington and Castle, and Witton and Rudheath wards in their proposed Eddisbury and Northwich constituency.

3.148 In addition to the party proposals we also received counter-proposals from members of the public. One such proposal came from Terry Largan (BCE-30392 and BCE-40907) who considered that the initial proposals were too radical. Under his proposal the Eddisbury and Northwich constituency would include the wards of Farndon, Tarporley, Tattenhall, and Tarvin and Kelsall. Citing evidence put forward at the Chester public hearing by the Member of Parliament for Eddisbury, Antoinette Sandbach (BCE-32792), Mr Largan considered that the four wards are strongly linked to each other but not to Weaver Vale. He also noted that Farndon has strong links with the Malpas ward which is currently placed in the initially proposed Eddisbury and Northwich constituency. Mr Largan further considered that keeping these wards together in a rural Eddisbury constituency would produce a result which was ‘more cohesive and coherent.’ Making these changes consequently allowed him to reconfigure Weaver Vale. He proposed retaining Hartford and Greenbank, and Winnington and Castle wards in their current constituency of Weaver Vale, as this would cause less disruption. Then

he proposed transferring the Elton ward from Ellesmere Port and Neston to Weaver Vale, a recommendation based upon the evidence of Simon Eardley (BCE-32772) who argued that the ward looked more towards Frodsham and Helsby rather than Ellesmere Port. This view was shared by the Conservative Party and a former councillor for Elton ward, Graham Heatley (BCE-21166). In his representation, he noted that ‘villages in the ward are mainly residential and agricultural dwellings with little more than 150-200 in each village. A far cry from the urban mass that is Ellesmere Port.’

3.149 Mr Largan also recommended that the Audlem ward should move from the Eddisbury and Northwich constituency to Crewe and Nantwich, reasoning that residents of Audlem look to Crewe and Nantwich for their services. This idea was shared by the Member of Parliament for Eddisbury, Antoinette Sandbach (BCE-32792), and Edward Timpson, the former Member of Parliament for Crewe and Nantwich (BCE-32740). Some residents of the Audlem ward, such as Michael Alvar Jones (BCE-22523), were in favour of the proposed ward transfer. He noted that ‘Audlem is physically closer to Nantwich than the major towns in Eddisbury’ and that ‘Most children from Audlem attend secondary schools in Nantwich.’ Others such as James Mason (BCE-38051), Alison Hiscock (BCE-38039), Andrew Wilson (BCE-38021) and Peter Kent (BCE-36845) were opposed to the move as they considered the two areas to have different interests and needs.

3.150 In light of the evidence our assistant commissioners considered the counter-proposals received. They found that the counter proposal submitted by Mr Largan offered a solution which was less radical than the initial proposals and, as noted above, produced constituencies which much better matched the existing position for Cheshire, and more accurately reflected both the geographical area and name of Weaver Vale. They therefore recommended this composition and suggested that the two mid Cheshire constituencies retain their respective names, Weaver Vale and Eddisbury. We agree with their recommendation.

3.151 Unlike for Eddisbury and Weaver Vale, there was no consensus among the political parties in the approach to the cross-county constituencies between Cheshire and Greater Manchester. The Labour and the Liberal Democrat parties supported our changes for Macclesfield with the Liberal Democrat Party (BCE-29373) saying that ‘the towns of Macclesfield and Wilmslow fit together logically.’ This was also supported by Terry Largan, with the proviso that the Wilmslow Dean Row ward should be included with the other Wilmslow wards. He noted that moving Alderley Edge and Wilmslow into a Macclesfield constituency was sensible as, until the creation of Cheshire East in 2009, both areas were formerly part of Macclesfield Borough. The counter-proposals submitted by Aaron Fear (BCE-31190 and BCE-40972), and the Conservative Party (BCE-33246), disagreed with the initial proposals. They favoured a Macclesfield constituency which orientated westward towards

Knutsford and which included the three Cheshire wards currently included in our proposed Altrincham and Tatton Park constituency. Under the Conservative Party counter-proposal there would be no crossing of the border between Altrincham and Tatton Park. They considered that this was a poor place to base a cross-county constituency, as the boroughs of Trafford and Cheshire East had few connections and were clearly separated by the River Bollin. The crossing point between Greater Manchester and Cheshire would instead be further east with the creation of a Cheadle and Wilmslow constituency. The Conservatives believed that a constituency comprised of Cheadle and Wilmslow wards would be a much better crossing point as there is 'continuous residential development between the two areas' and it has 'a strong communication link [in the form] of the A34.'

3.152 The assistant commissioners accepted that the River Bollin formed an identifiable division between Greater Manchester and Cheshire, however they considered that it was not an insurmountable obstacle and that an Altrincham and Tatton Park constituency, as set out in the initial proposals, could work. Additionally, the assistant commissioners were not persuaded by the Conservative Party's counter-proposals, since they resulted in wholesale alterations to constituencies in Greater Manchester, which under the initial proposals remain unchanged.

3.153 Despite this, they did accept that the proposal could be terms of the name. Jonathan Stansby (BCE-16860) suggested that Altrincham and Tatton Park should be renamed Altrincham and Knutsford as 'Only a small part of the old Tatton ward is included in this new constituency and Tatton Park itself is a National Trust property which will include no more than a handful of the electorate.' The assistant commissioners agreed that this was a sensible suggestion and recommended that the constituency be renamed Altrincham and Knutsford. We accept their recommendation.

3.154 The configuration of the Macclesfield constituency is as described in the section dealing with Greater Manchester. We agree with the recommendation that Poynton and Disley be included in the Macclesfield constituency, and the wards in and around Wilmslow be included in the Hazel Grove and Wilmslow constituency.

4 How to have your say

4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for an eight-week period, from 17 October 2017 to 11 December 2017. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Government.

4.2 While people are welcome to write to us on any issue regarding the constituency boundaries we set out in this report and the accompanying maps, our main focus during this final consultation is on those constituencies we have revised since our initial proposals. While we will consider representations that comment again on the initial proposals that we have not revised, it is likely that particularly compelling further evidence or submissions will be needed to persuade us to depart at this late stage in the review from those of our initial proposals, which have withstood intensive scrutiny of objections in the process of consultation and review to which they have already been subject. Representations relating to initial proposals that we have not revised and that simply repeat evidence or arguments that have already been raised in either of the previous two consultation stages are likely to carry little weight with the Commission.

4.3 When responding, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament and the decisions we have taken regarding adoption of a regional approach and use of local government wards discussed in chapter 2 and in the Guide. Most importantly:

- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that are more than 5% above or below the electoral quota (apart from the two covering the Isle of Wight).
- We are obliged by law to use the Parliamentary electorate figures as they were in the statutory electoral register published by local electoral registration officers between December 2015 and February 2016. We therefore cannot base our proposals for this constituency review on any subsequent electorate figures.
- We are basing our revised proposals on local government ward boundaries (at May 2015) as the building blocks of constituencies. Exceptional and compelling evidence needs to be provided to persuade us that splitting a ward across two constituencies is necessary or appropriate.
- We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries. Particularly compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us that we should depart from this approach.

4.4 These issues mean that we encourage people who are making a representation on a specific area to bear in mind the knock-on effects of their counter-proposals. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to bear in mind the impact of their counter-proposals on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

4.5 We encourage everyone to make use of our consultation website, www.bce2018.org.uk, when contributing to our consultation. That website contains all the information you will need to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, including the revised proposals reports and maps, all the representations we have received so far during the review, the initial proposals reports and maps, the electorate sizes of every ward, and an online facility where you can instantly and directly submit to us your views on our revised proposals. If you are unable to access our consultation website for any reason, you can still write to us at 35 Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BQ.

4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to data protection and privacy and, in particular, the publication of all representations and personal data within them. This is available in our Data Protection and Privacy Policy, at:

<http://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/freedom-of-information-and-data-protection>

What do we want views on?

4.7 We would like particularly to ask two things of those considering responding on the revised proposals we have set out. First, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so, as well as telling us where you object to them. Past experience suggests that too often people who agree with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points – this can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to proposals. Second, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, do please use the resources available on our website and at the places of deposit (maps and electorate figures) to put forward counter-proposals which are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.

4.8 Above all, however, we encourage everyone to have their say on our revised proposals and, in doing so, to become involved in drawing the map of new Parliamentary constituencies. This is the final chance to contribute to the design of the new constituencies, and the more views we get on those constituencies, the more informed our consideration in developing them will be, and the better we will be able to reflect the public's views in the final recommendations we present in September 2018.

Annex A: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
1. Accrington CC			73,077
	Gawthorpe	Burnley	4,417
	Hapton with Park	Burnley	4,489
	Rosegrove with Lowerhouse	Burnley	4,456
	Altham	Hyndburn	3,982
	Barnfield	Hyndburn	3,233
	Baxenden	Hyndburn	3,333
	Central	Hyndburn	3,596
	Church	Hyndburn	3,260
	Clayton-le-Moors	Hyndburn	3,547
	Huncoat	Hyndburn	3,569
	Immanuel	Hyndburn	3,508
	Milnshaw	Hyndburn	3,485
	Netherton	Hyndburn	3,239
	Overton	Hyndburn	4,964
	Peel	Hyndburn	2,999
	Rishton	Hyndburn	5,093
	Spring Hill	Hyndburn	3,474
	St. Andrew's	Hyndburn	3,357
	St. Oswald's	Hyndburn	5,076
2. Altrincham and Knutsford CC			77,647
	High Legh	Cheshire East	3,349
	Knutsford	Cheshire East	9,902
	Mobberley	Cheshire East	3,357
	Altrincham	Trafford	8,160
	Bowdon	Trafford	7,073
	Broadheath	Trafford	9,336
	Bucklow-St. Martins	Trafford	6,520
	Hale Barns	Trafford	7,132
	Hale Central	Trafford	7,084
	Timperley	Trafford	8,267
	Village	Trafford	7,467
3. Ashton-under-Lyne BC			76,869
	Ashton Hurst	Tameside	8,561
	Ashton St. Michael's	Tameside	8,157
	Ashton Waterloo	Tameside	8,338
	Dukinfield	Tameside	9,046
	Dukinfield Stalybridge	Tameside	8,596
	Mossley	Tameside	8,485
	St. Peter's	Tameside	8,283
	Stalybridge North	Tameside	9,086
	Stalybridge South	Tameside	8,317
4. Barrow and Furness CC			74,264
	Barrow Island	Barrow-in-Furness	1,665
	Central	Barrow-in-Furness	2,792
	Dalton North	Barrow-in-Furness	4,948
	Dalton South	Barrow-in-Furness	4,728
	Hawcoat	Barrow-in-Furness	4,156
	Hindpool	Barrow-in-Furness	4,243
	Newbarns	Barrow-in-Furness	4,455
	Ormsgill	Barrow-in-Furness	4,275

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Parkside	Barrow-in-Furness	4,331
	Risedale	Barrow-in-Furness	4,554
	Roosecote	Barrow-in-Furness	3,934
	Walney North	Barrow-in-Furness	4,295
	Walney South	Barrow-in-Furness	4,123
	Haverigg	Copeland	1,028
	Holborn Hill	Copeland	1,935
	Millom Without	Copeland	1,092
	Newtown	Copeland	2,635
	Broughton	South Lakeland	1,782
	Low Furness	South Lakeland	1,411
	Mid Furness	South Lakeland	3,083
	Ulverston Central	South Lakeland	1,387
	Ulverston East	South Lakeland	1,552
	Ulverston North	South Lakeland	1,521
	Ulverston South	South Lakeland	1,453
	Ulverston Town	South Lakeland	1,421
	Ulverston West	South Lakeland	1,465
5. Bebington and Heswall CC			76,062
	Bebington	Wirral	11,827
	Clatterbridge	Wirral	11,460
	Greasby, Frankby and Irby	Wirral	11,342
	Heswall	Wirral	10,655
	Hoylake and Meols	Wirral	10,300
	Pensby and Thingwall	Wirral	10,319
	West Kirby and Thurstaston	Wirral	10,159
6. Birkenhead BC			72,003
	Bidston and St. James	Wirral	9,694
	Birkenhead and Tranmere	Wirral	9,305
	Bromborough	Wirral	11,158
	Claughton	Wirral	11,035
	Oxton	Wirral	10,866
	Prenton	Wirral	10,604
	Rock Ferry	Wirral	9,341
7. Blackburn BC			72,816
	Audley	Blackburn with Darwen	5,595
	Bastwell	Blackburn with Darwen	4,883
	Beardwood with Lammack	Blackburn with Darwen	4,445
	Corporation Park	Blackburn with Darwen	4,666
	Ewood	Blackburn with Darwen	4,360
	Fernhurst	Blackburn with Darwen	4,125
	Higher Croft	Blackburn with Darwen	4,818
	Little Harwood	Blackburn with Darwen	4,511
	Livesey with Pleasington	Blackburn with Darwen	5,289
	Meadowhead	Blackburn with Darwen	4,107
	Mill Hill	Blackburn with Darwen	3,721
	Queen's Park	Blackburn with Darwen	3,918
	Roe Lee	Blackburn with Darwen	4,450
	Shadsworth with Whitebirk	Blackburn with Darwen	4,792
	Shear Brow	Blackburn with Darwen	4,962
	Wensley Fold	Blackburn with Darwen	4,174
8. Blackley and Broughton BC			72,003
	Charlestown	Manchester	10,066
	Cheetham	Manchester	13,726
	Crumpsall	Manchester	10,546
	Harpurhey	Manchester	11,199
	Higher Blackley	Manchester	10,298
	Broughton	Salford	8,412
	Kersal	Salford	7,756

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
9. Blackpool North and Fleetwood BC			73,480
	Anchorsholme	Blackpool	4,978
	Bispham	Blackpool	4,731
	Greenlands	Blackpool	4,896
	Ingthorpe	Blackpool	4,866
	Norbreck	Blackpool	4,955
	Bourne	Wyre	4,371
	Breck	Wyre	2,855
	Carleton	Wyre	3,522
	Cleveleys Park	Wyre	3,684
	Jubilee	Wyre	3,580
	Marsh Mill	Wyre	4,716
	Mount	Wyre	3,596
	Park	Wyre	3,259
	Pharos	Wyre	3,166
	Pheasant's Wood	Wyre	1,545
	Rossall	Wyre	4,260
	Stanah	Wyre	3,673
	Victoria & Norcross	Wyre	3,507
	Warren	Wyre	3,320
10. Blackpool South BC			72,993
	Bloomfield	Blackpool	3,898
	Brunswick	Blackpool	4,174
	Claremont	Blackpool	4,442
	Clifton	Blackpool	4,706
	Hawes Side	Blackpool	4,743
	Highfield	Blackpool	4,905
	Layton	Blackpool	4,538
	Marton	Blackpool	4,965
	Park	Blackpool	4,822
	Squires Gate	Blackpool	4,603
	Stanley	Blackpool	4,980
	Talbot	Blackpool	4,144
	Tyldesley	Blackpool	4,546
	Victoria	Blackpool	4,533
	Warbreck	Blackpool	4,584
	Waterloo	Blackpool	4,410
11. Bolton North East BC			73,610
	Astley Bridge	Bolton	9,911
	Bradshaw	Bolton	8,589
	Brightmet	Bolton	9,027
	Bromley Cross	Bolton	10,217
	Crompton	Bolton	9,659
	Great Lever	Bolton	8,722
	Rumworth	Bolton	9,085
	Tonge with the Haulgh	Bolton	8,400
12. Bolton West CC			77,798
	Halliwell	Bolton	8,078
	Heaton and Lostock	Bolton	10,303
	Horwich North East	Bolton	9,590
	Horwich and Blackrod	Bolton	9,765
	Smithills	Bolton	9,758
	Westhoughton North and Chew Moor	Bolton	10,550
	Westhoughton South	Bolton	9,417
	Atherton	Wigan	10,337
13. Bootle BC			77,290
	County	Liverpool	9,088
	Warbreck	Liverpool	10,761
	Church	Sefton	8,550

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Derby	Sefton	8,174
	Ford	Sefton	8,599
	Linacre	Sefton	7,423
	Litherland	Sefton	7,977
	Netherton and Orrell	Sefton	8,847
	St. Oswald	Sefton	7,871
14. Burnley CC			75,569
	Bank Hall	Burnley	3,971
	Briercliffe	Burnley	4,337
	Brunshaw	Burnley	4,669
	Cliviger with Worsthorne	Burnley	4,209
	Coal Clough with Deerplay	Burnley	3,892
	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	Burnley	3,685
	Gannow	Burnley	4,150
	Lanehead	Burnley	4,416
	Queensgate	Burnley	3,887
	Rosehill with Burnley Wood	Burnley	4,293
	Trinity	Burnley	3,682
	Whittlefield with Ightenhill	Burnley	4,675
	Bradley	Pendle	4,022
	Brierfield	Pendle	3,486
	Clover Hill	Pendle	3,336
	Marsden	Pendle	2,386
	Reedley	Pendle	4,178
	Southfield	Pendle	3,468
	Walverden	Pendle	2,485
	Whitefield	Pendle	2,342
15. Bury BC			71,594
	Church	Bury	8,163
	East	Bury	7,320
	Elton	Bury	8,420
	Moorside	Bury	8,196
	North Manor	Bury	7,984
	Ramsbottom	Bury	8,669
	Redvales	Bury	8,115
	Tottington	Bury	7,697
	Unsworth	Bury	7,030
16. Carlisle CC			76,825
	Belah	Carlisle	4,648
	Belle Vue	Carlisle	4,592
	Botcherby	Carlisle	3,961
	Brampton	Carlisle	3,422
	Burgh	Carlisle	1,630
	Castle	Carlisle	3,478
	Currock	Carlisle	4,053
	Dalston	Carlisle	4,802
	Denton Holme	Carlisle	4,207
	Great Corby and Geltsdale	Carlisle	1,659
	Harraby	Carlisle	4,661
	Hayton	Carlisle	1,574
	Irthing	Carlisle	1,516
	Longtown & Rockcliffe	Carlisle	2,978
	Lyne	Carlisle	1,541
	Morton	Carlisle	4,376
	St. Aidans	Carlisle	3,882
	Stanwix Rural	Carlisle	3,628
	Stanwix Urban	Carlisle	4,386
	Upperby	Carlisle	3,579
	Wetheral	Carlisle	3,736
	Yewdale	Carlisle	4,516

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
17. Chorley CC			78,287
	Adlington and Anderton	Chorley	5,769
	Astley and Buckshaw	Chorley	4,320
	Brindle and Hoghton	Chorley	1,671
	Chisnall	Chorley	3,238
	Chorley East	Chorley	4,956
	Chorley North East	Chorley	4,717
	Chorley North West	Chorley	4,566
	Chorley South East	Chorley	5,411
	Chorley South West	Chorley	5,817
	Clayton-le-Woods and Whittle-le-Woods	Chorley	6,425
	Clayton-le-Woods North	Chorley	4,848
	Clayton-le-Woods West and Cuerden	Chorley	3,451
	Coppull	Chorley	4,823
	Eccleston and Mawdesley	Chorley	4,964
	Euxton North	Chorley	3,483
	Euxton South	Chorley	3,113
	Heath Charnock and Rivington	Chorley	1,739
	Pennine	Chorley	1,768
	Wheelton and Withnell	Chorley	3,208
18. City of Chester CC			73,723
	Blacon	Cheshire West and Chester	9,977
	Boughton	Cheshire West and Chester	4,097
	Chester City	Cheshire West and Chester	2,784
	Chester Villages	Cheshire West and Chester	6,806
	Dodleston and Huntington	Cheshire West and Chester	3,574
	Garden Quarter	Cheshire West and Chester	3,437
	Great Boughton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,192
	Handbridge Park	Cheshire West and Chester	7,184
	Hoole	Cheshire West and Chester	6,787
	Lache	Cheshire West and Chester	3,755
	Newton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,363
	Saughall and Mollington	Cheshire West and Chester	3,828
	Upton	Cheshire West and Chester	6,939
19. Congleton CC			71,287
	Alsager	Cheshire East	8,998
	Brereton Rural	Cheshire East	3,797
	Congleton East	Cheshire East	10,104
	Congleton West	Cheshire East	10,053
	Dane Valley	Cheshire East	7,416
	Middlewich	Cheshire East	10,089
	Odd Rode	Cheshire East	6,619
	Sandbach Elworth	Cheshire East	3,614
	Sandbach Ettiley Heath and Wheelock	Cheshire East	3,580
	Sandbach Heath and East	Cheshire East	3,318
	Sandbach Town	Cheshire East	3,699
20. Crewe and Nantwich CC			76,041
	Audlem	Cheshire East	3,715
	Crewe Central	Cheshire East	2,863
	Crewe East	Cheshire East	9,429
	Crewe North	Cheshire East	3,202
	Crewe South	Cheshire East	2,963
	Crewe St. Barnabas	Cheshire East	6,307
	Crewe West	Cheshire East	6,527
	Haslington	Cheshire East	6,240
	Leighton	Cheshire East	3,889
	Nantwich North and West	Cheshire East	6,550
	Nantwich South and Stapeley	Cheshire East	6,320
	Shavington	Cheshire East	3,091
	Willaston and Rope	Cheshire East	3,670

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Wistaston	Cheshire East	7,200
	Wybunbury	Cheshire East	4,075
21. Eddisbury CC			72,293
	Bunbury	Cheshire East	3,530
	Wrenbury	Cheshire East	3,634
	Davenham and Moulton	Cheshire West and Chester	10,641
	Farndon	Cheshire West and Chester	3,346
	Malpas	Cheshire West and Chester	3,444
	Shakerley	Cheshire West and Chester	3,431
	Tarporley	Cheshire West and Chester	3,894
	Tarvin and Kelsall	Cheshire West and Chester	6,973
	Tattenhall	Cheshire West and Chester	3,626
	Winsford Over and Verdin	Cheshire West and Chester	9,672
	Winsford Swanlow and Dene	Cheshire West and Chester	6,708
	Winsford Wharton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,100
	Witton and Rudheath	Cheshire West and Chester	6,294
22. Ellesmere Port and Neston CC			73,599
	Ellesmere Port Town	Cheshire West and Chester	6,384
	Grange	Cheshire West and Chester	3,321
	Ledsham and Manor	Cheshire West and Chester	6,385
	Little Neston and Burton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,022
	Neston	Cheshire West and Chester	3,176
	Netherpool	Cheshire West and Chester	2,741
	Parkgate	Cheshire West and Chester	3,128
	Rossmore	Cheshire West and Chester	2,914
	St. Paul's	Cheshire West and Chester	6,669
	Strawberry	Cheshire West and Chester	4,192
	Sutton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,022
	Whitby	Cheshire West and Chester	6,503
	Willaston and Thornton	Cheshire West and Chester	3,270
	Eastham	Wirral	10,872
23. Failsworth and Droylsden BC			78,407
	Alexandra	Oldham	6,212
	Failsworth East	Oldham	7,687
	Failsworth West	Oldham	7,386
	Hollinwood	Oldham	7,171
	Medlock Vale	Oldham	7,845
	St. Mary's	Oldham	8,151
	Werneth	Oldham	7,261
	Audenshaw	Tameside	9,165
	Droylsden East	Tameside	8,705
	Droylsden West	Tameside	8,824
24. Farnworth and Radcliffe BC			72,031
	Farnworth	Bolton	9,838
	Harper Green	Bolton	9,160
	Hulton	Bolton	9,480
	Kearsley	Bolton	10,005
	Little Lever and Darcy Lever	Bolton	9,320
	Radcliffe East	Bury	8,217
	Radcliffe North	Bury	8,207
	Radcliffe West	Bury	7,804
25. Fylde CC			72,193
	Ansdell	Fylde	3,443
	Ashton	Fylde	3,621
	Central	Fylde	3,073
	Clifton	Fylde	3,246
	Elswick and Little Eccleston	Fylde	1,228
	Fairhaven	Fylde	3,368
	Freckleton East	Fylde	2,332

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Freckleton West	Fylde	2,237
	Heyhouses	Fylde	3,654
	Kilnhouse	Fylde	3,156
	Kirkham North	Fylde	3,032
	Kirkham South	Fylde	2,021
	Medlar-with-Wesham	Fylde	2,845
	Newton and Treales	Fylde	2,412
	Park	Fylde	4,146
	Ribby-with-Wrea	Fylde	1,200
	Singleton and Greenhalgh	Fylde	1,149
	St. Johns	Fylde	3,639
	St. Leonards	Fylde	3,311
	Staining and Weeton	Fylde	2,316
	Warton and Westby	Fylde	3,952
	Lea	Preston	4,562
	Hardhorn with High Cross	Wyre	4,967
	Tithebarn	Wyre	3,283
26. Garston and Halewood BC			71,942
	Halewood North	Knowsley	5,044
	Halewood South	Knowsley	5,487
	Halewood West	Knowsley	5,158
	Allerton and Hunts Cross	Liverpool	11,090
	Belle Vale	Liverpool	11,158
	Cressington	Liverpool	11,285
	Speke-Garston	Liverpool	12,523
	Woolton	Liverpool	10,197
27. Hazel Grove and Wilmslow BC			77,051
	Alderley Edge	Cheshire East	3,425
	Handforth	Cheshire East	6,709
	Wilmslow Dean Row	Cheshire East	3,294
	Wilmslow East	Cheshire East	2,880
	Wilmslow Lacey Green	Cheshire East	3,304
	Wilmslow West and Chorley	Cheshire East	7,442
	Bramhall North	Stockport	10,263
	Bramhall South	Stockport	9,589
	Hazel Grove	Stockport	10,488
	Offerton	Stockport	10,016
	Stepping Hill	Stockport	9,641
28. Knowsley BC			77,916
	Cherryfield	Knowsley	5,424
	Kirkby Central	Knowsley	4,699
	Longview	Knowsley	6,386
	Northwood	Knowsley	5,379
	Page Moss	Knowsley	4,851
	Park	Knowsley	4,992
	Prescot West	Knowsley	5,042
	Roby	Knowsley	5,807
	Shevington	Knowsley	5,201
	St. Bartholomews	Knowsley	5,278
	St. Gabriels	Knowsley	5,160
	St. Michaels	Knowsley	5,184
	Stockbridge	Knowsley	4,423
	Swanside	Knowsley	5,319
	Whitefield	Knowsley	4,771
29. Lancaster and Morecambe CC			74,361
	Bare	Lancaster	5,392
	Bolton & Slyne	Lancaster	5,814
	Bulk	Lancaster	4,592
	Castle	Lancaster	3,455

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Harbour	Lancaster	4,759
	Heysham Central	Lancaster	3,268
	Heysham North	Lancaster	3,058
	Heysham South	Lancaster	4,790
	John O'Gaunt	Lancaster	4,796
	Marsh	Lancaster	3,276
	Overton	Lancaster	1,672
	Poulton	Lancaster	3,255
	Scotforth East	Lancaster	3,221
	Scotforth West	Lancaster	4,868
	Skerton East	Lancaster	4,520
	Skerton West	Lancaster	4,879
	Torrisholme	Lancaster	3,535
	Westgate	Lancaster	5,211
30. Leigh CC			73,070
	Astley Mosley Common	Wigan	9,026
	Atherleigh	Wigan	8,007
	Golborne and Lowton West	Wigan	8,458
	Leigh East	Wigan	8,588
	Leigh South	Wigan	9,848
	Leigh West	Wigan	9,681
	Lowton East	Wigan	9,452
	Tyldesley	Wigan	10,010
31. Littleborough and Saddleworth CC			75,713
	Crompton	Oldham	8,064
	Saddleworth North	Oldham	7,651
	Saddleworth South	Oldham	8,030
	Saddleworth West and Lees	Oldham	8,246
	Shaw	Oldham	7,388
	Balderstone and Kirkholt	Rochdale	6,636
	Littleborough Lakeside	Rochdale	7,410
	Milnrow and Newhey	Rochdale	7,582
	Smallbridge and Firgrove	Rochdale	7,344
	Wardle and West Littleborough	Rochdale	7,362
32. Liverpool Riverside BC			77,665
	Anfield	Liverpool	8,764
	Central	Liverpool	9,353
	Everton	Liverpool	9,832
	Kirkdale	Liverpool	10,453
	Mossley Hill	Liverpool	9,639
	Princes Park	Liverpool	9,174
	Riverside	Liverpool	11,460
	St. Michael's	Liverpool	8,990
33. Liverpool Wavertree BC			76,261
	Childwall	Liverpool	10,784
	Church	Liverpool	10,373
	Greenbank	Liverpool	7,985
	Kensington and Fairfield	Liverpool	8,036
	Old Swan	Liverpool	10,679
	Picton	Liverpool	8,756
	Tuebrook and Stoneycroft	Liverpool	9,675
	Wavertree	Liverpool	9,973
34. Liverpool West Derby BC			73,950
	Clubmoor	Liverpool	10,704
	Croxteth	Liverpool	9,980
	Fazakerley	Liverpool	10,768
	Knotty Ash	Liverpool	10,095
	Norris Green	Liverpool	10,233
	West Derby	Liverpool	10,895
	Yew Tree	Liverpool	11,275

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
35. Macclesfield CC			72,751
	Bollington	Cheshire East	6,298
	Broken Cross and Upton	Cheshire East	6,408
	Chelford	Cheshire East	3,169
	Disley	Cheshire East	3,485
	Gawsworth	Cheshire East	3,079
	Macclesfield Central	Cheshire East	6,102
	Macclesfield East	Cheshire East	3,249
	Macclesfield Hurdsfield	Cheshire East	3,188
	Macclesfield South	Cheshire East	5,898
	Macclesfield Tytherington	Cheshire East	6,690
	Macclesfield West and Ivy	Cheshire East	5,814
	Poynton East and Pott Shrigley	Cheshire East	6,037
	Poynton West and Adlington	Cheshire East	6,584
	Prestbury	Cheshire East	3,321
	Sutton	Cheshire East	3,429
36. Makerfield CC			71,857
	Abram	Wigan	9,935
	Ashton	Wigan	8,709
	Bryn	Wigan	8,746
	Hindley	Wigan	9,264
	Hindley Green	Wigan	8,268
	Orrell	Wigan	9,320
	Winstanley	Wigan	8,917
	Worsley Mesnes	Wigan	8,698
37. Manchester Central BC			76,173
	Ancoats and Clayton	Manchester	12,525
	Ardwick	Manchester	9,809
	Bradford	Manchester	11,488
	City Centre	Manchester	9,483
	Hulme	Manchester	10,149
	Miles Platting and Newton Heath	Manchester	10,254
	Moss Side	Manchester	12,465
38. Manchester Gorton BC			74,227
	Fallowfield	Manchester	10,692
	Gorton North	Manchester	10,337
	Gorton South	Manchester	12,234
	Levenshulme	Manchester	10,743
	Longsight	Manchester	9,755
	Rusholme	Manchester	9,758
	Whalley Range	Manchester	10,708
39. Manchester Withington BC			74,616
	Burnage	Manchester	10,812
	Chorlton	Manchester	10,817
	Chorlton Park	Manchester	11,263
	Didsbury East	Manchester	10,745
	Didsbury West	Manchester	9,927
	Old Moat	Manchester	11,003
	Withington	Manchester	10,049
40. Marple and Hyde CC			74,907
	Bredbury Green and Romiley	Stockport	10,615
	Bredbury and Woodley	Stockport	10,358
	Marple North	Stockport	9,622
	Marple South	Stockport	9,619
	Hyde Godley	Tameside	8,436
	Hyde Newton	Tameside	9,989
	Hyde Werneth	Tameside	8,514
	Longdendale	Tameside	7,754

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
41. North Lancashire CC			71,284
	Carnforth & Millhead	Lancaster	4,446
	Ellel	Lancaster	3,276
	Halton-with-Aughton	Lancaster	1,947
	Kellet	Lancaster	1,639
	Lower Lune Valley	Lancaster	3,525
	Silverdale	Lancaster	1,616
	University & Scotforth Rural	Lancaster	2,065
	Upper Lune Valley	Lancaster	1,878
	Warton	Lancaster	1,604
	Preston Rural East	Preston	3,552
	Preston Rural North	Preston	5,328
	Aughton, Bailey and Chaigley	Ribble Valley	1,134
	Alston and Hothersall	Ribble Valley	2,070
	Bowland, Newton and Slaidburn	Ribble Valley	1,074
	Chatburn	Ribble Valley	1,063
	Chipping	Ribble Valley	1,111
	Derby and Thornley	Ribble Valley	2,394
	Dilworth	Ribble Valley	1,986
	Gisburn, Rimington	Ribble Valley	1,083
	Ribchester	Ribble Valley	1,265
	Waddington and West Bradford	Ribble Valley	2,527
	Brock with Catterall	Wyre	3,058
	Calder	Wyre	1,676
	Garstang	Wyre	5,280
	Great Eccleston	Wyre	3,073
	Hambleton & Stalmine	Wyre	3,500
	Pilling	Wyre	1,907
	Preesall	Wyre	4,615
	Wyresdale	Wyre	1,592
42. Oldham BC			73,825
	Moston	Manchester	11,166
	Chadderton Central	Oldham	7,782
	Chadderton North	Oldham	8,114
	Chadderton South	Oldham	7,509
	Coldhurst	Oldham	7,933
	Royton North	Oldham	7,736
	Royton South	Oldham	8,105
	St. James'	Oldham	7,556
	Waterhead	Oldham	7,924
43. Pendle and Ribble Valley CC			73,788
	Barrowford	Pendle	3,823
	Blacko and Higherford	Pendle	1,424
	Boulsworth	Pendle	4,071
	Coates	Pendle	3,984
	Craven	Pendle	4,073
	Earby	Pendle	4,605
	Foulridge	Pendle	1,299
	Higham and Pendleside	Pendle	1,414
	Horsfield	Pendle	3,668
	Old Laund Booth	Pendle	1,225
	Vivary Bridge	Pendle	4,028
	Waterside	Pendle	3,574
	Billington and Old Langho	Ribble Valley	2,414
	Clayton-le-Dale with Ramsgreave	Ribble Valley	2,082
	Edisford and Low Moor	Ribble Valley	2,358
	Langho	Ribble Valley	1,890
	Littlemoor	Ribble Valley	2,371
	Mellor	Ribble Valley	2,228
	Primrose	Ribble Valley	2,501

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Read and Simonstone	Ribble Valley	2,080
	Sabden	Ribble Valley	1,192
	Salthill	Ribble Valley	2,308
	St. Mary's	Ribble Valley	2,274
	Whalley	Ribble Valley	3,078
	Wilpshire	Ribble Valley	2,077
	Wiswell and Pendleton	Ribble Valley	1,244
	Coupe Green & Gregson Lane	South Ribble	3,449
	Samplesbury & Walton	South Ribble	3,054
44. Penrith and Solway CC			72,284
	All Saints	Allerdale	3,680
	Aspatria	Allerdale	2,465
	Boltons	Allerdale	1,358
	Broughton St. Bridget's	Allerdale	2,984
	Christchurch	Allerdale	3,033
	Crummock	Allerdale	1,211
	Dalton	Allerdale	1,427
	Derwent Valley	Allerdale	1,152
	Ellen	Allerdale	2,558
	Holme	Allerdale	1,226
	Keswick	Allerdale	3,971
	Marsh	Allerdale	1,284
	Silloth	Allerdale	2,541
	Solway	Allerdale	1,270
	Wampool	Allerdale	1,350
	Warnell	Allerdale	1,568
	Waver	Allerdale	1,471
	Wharrels	Allerdale	1,228
	Wigton	Allerdale	4,356
	Alston Moor	Eden	1,638
	Askham	Eden	1,049
	Crosby Ravensworth	Eden	1,131
	Dacre	Eden	1,118
	Eamont	Eden	1,180
	Greystoke	Eden	1,138
	Hartside	Eden	1,039
	Hesket	Eden	2,403
	Kirkby Thore	Eden	1,173
	Kirkoswald	Eden	1,132
	Langwathby	Eden	1,245
	Lazonby	Eden	1,107
	Long Marton	Eden	952
	Morland	Eden	1,004
	Penrith Carleton	Eden	1,230
	Penrith East	Eden	2,052
	Penrith North	Eden	3,178
	Penrith Pategill	Eden	1,025
	Penrith South	Eden	1,905
	Penrith West	Eden	2,163
	Shap	Eden	1,077
	Skelton	Eden	1,203
	Ullswater	Eden	1,009
45. Preston BC			77,324
	Ashton	Preston	2,993
	Brookfield	Preston	5,003
	Cadley	Preston	3,582
	College	Preston	2,700
	Deepdale	Preston	3,595
	Fishwick	Preston	3,260
	Garrison	Preston	5,282

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Greyfriars	Preston	5,188
	Ingol	Preston	5,038
	Larches	Preston	5,410
	Moor Park	Preston	2,830
	Ribbleton	Preston	5,337
	Riversway	Preston	3,738
	Sharoe Green	Preston	4,679
	St. George's	Preston	3,171
	St. Matthew's	Preston	4,285
	Town Centre	Preston	4,749
	Tulketh	Preston	4,593
	University	Preston	1,891
46. Prestwich and Middleton BC			77,122
	Besses	Bury	7,667
	Holyrood	Bury	8,333
	Pilkington Park	Bury	7,328
	Sedgley	Bury	8,128
	St. Mary's	Bury	7,371
	East Middleton	Rochdale	7,371
	Hopwood Hall	Rochdale	7,798
	North Middleton	Rochdale	7,462
	South Middleton	Rochdale	7,631
	West Middleton	Rochdale	8,033
47. Rochdale CC			73,781
	Bamford	Rochdale	7,377
	Castleton	Rochdale	7,400
	Central Rochdale	Rochdale	6,509
	Healey	Rochdale	7,674
	Kingsway	Rochdale	7,819
	Milkstone and Deeplish	Rochdale	6,804
	Norden	Rochdale	7,505
	North Heywood	Rochdale	7,164
	Spotland and Falinge	Rochdale	7,390
	West Heywood	Rochdale	8,139
48. Rossendale and Darwen CC			74,991
	Earcroft	Blackburn with Darwen	2,943
	East Rural	Blackburn with Darwen	1,462
	Marsh House	Blackburn with Darwen	4,442
	North Turton with Tockholes	Blackburn with Darwen	3,466
	Sudell	Blackburn with Darwen	4,343
	Sunnyhurst	Blackburn with Darwen	4,295
	Whitehall	Blackburn with Darwen	2,964
	Cribden	Rossendale	2,751
	Eden	Rossendale	2,864
	Facit and Shawforth	Rossendale	2,741
	Goodshaw	Rossendale	3,159
	Greenfield	Rossendale	4,325
	Greensclough	Rossendale	4,274
	Hareholme	Rossendale	4,050
	Healey and Whitworth	Rossendale	2,992
	Helmshore	Rossendale	4,776
	Irwell	Rossendale	4,013
	Longholme	Rossendale	4,083
	Stacksteads	Rossendale	2,802
	Whitewell	Rossendale	4,193
	Worsley	Rossendale	4,053
49. Salford and Eccles BC			74,161
	Claremont	Salford	8,117
	Eccles	Salford	8,514

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Irwell Riverside	Salford	6,439
	Langworthy	Salford	8,058
	Ordsall	Salford	9,482
	Pendlebury	Salford	8,786
	Swinton North	Salford	8,269
	Swinton South	Salford	8,125
	Weaste and Seedley	Salford	8,371
50. Sefton Central CC			76,378
	Blundellsands	Sefton	9,004
	Harington	Sefton	9,560
	Manor	Sefton	9,574
	Molyneux	Sefton	9,766
	Park	Sefton	9,456
	Ravenmeols	Sefton	9,162
	Sudell	Sefton	9,686
	Victoria	Sefton	10,170
51. South Ribble CC			78,502
	Lostock	Chorley	3,381
	Bamber Bridge East	South Ribble	3,184
	Bamber Bridge West	South Ribble	3,006
	Broad Oak	South Ribble	3,534
	Broadfield	South Ribble	3,573
	Buckshaw & Worden	South Ribble	3,642
	Charnock	South Ribble	2,785
	Earnshaw Bridge	South Ribble	3,438
	Farington East	South Ribble	2,791
	Farington West	South Ribble	2,844
	Hoole	South Ribble	3,237
	Howick & Priory	South Ribble	5,486
	Leyland Central	South Ribble	3,437
	Longton & Hutton West	South Ribble	4,550
	Lostock Hall	South Ribble	4,913
	Middleforth	South Ribble	5,370
	Moss Side	South Ribble	3,082
	New Longton & Hutton East	South Ribble	3,629
	Seven Stars	South Ribble	2,998
	St. Ambrose	South Ribble	3,167
	Walton-le-Dale East	South Ribble	3,172
	Walton-le-Dale West	South Ribble	3,283
52. Southport CC			75,828
	Ainsdale	Sefton	9,540
	Birkdale	Sefton	9,494
	Cambridge	Sefton	8,945
	Duke's	Sefton	9,181
	Kew	Sefton	8,901
	Meols	Sefton	9,528
	Norwood	Sefton	9,492
	Hesketh-with-Becconsall	West Lancashire	3,133
	North Meols	West Lancashire	3,177
	Tarleton	West Lancashire	4,437
53. St. Helens North BC			72,060
	Billinge and Seneley Green	St. Helens	8,503
	Blackbrook	St. Helens	7,946
	Earlestown	St. Helens	7,806
	Haydock	St. Helens	8,637
	Moss Bank	St. Helens	8,285
	Newton	St. Helens	8,608
	Parr	St. Helens	8,038
	Rainford	St. Helens	6,498
	Windle	St. Helens	7,739

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
54. St. Helens South and Whiston BC			74,885
	Prescot East	Knowsley	5,671
	Whiston North	Knowsley	5,396
	Whiston South	Knowsley	5,302
	Bold	St. Helens	7,201
	Eccleston	St. Helens	9,127
	Rainhill	St. Helens	8,724
	Sutton	St. Helens	8,618
	Thatto Heath	St. Helens	9,153
	Town Centre	St. Helens	7,249
	West Park	St. Helens	8,444
55. Stockport North and Denton BC			75,516
	Brinnington and Central	Stockport	9,611
	Heatons North	Stockport	10,269
	Manor	Stockport	9,979
	Reddish North	Stockport	10,018
	Reddish South	Stockport	9,919
	Denton North East	Tameside	8,325
	Denton South	Tameside	8,156
	Denton West	Tameside	9,239
56. Stockport South and Cheadle BC			71,841
	Cheadle Hulme North	Stockport	9,682
	Cheadle Hulme South	Stockport	10,256
	Cheadle and Gatley	Stockport	11,434
	Davenport and Cale Green	Stockport	10,249
	Edgeley and Cheadle Heath	Stockport	10,005
	Heald Green	Stockport	9,664
	Heatons South	Stockport	10,551
57. Stretford and Urmston BC			76,104
	Ashton upon Mersey	Trafford	7,140
	Clifford	Trafford	7,004
	Davyhulme East	Trafford	7,358
	Davyhulme West	Trafford	7,413
	Flixton	Trafford	8,051
	Gorse Hill	Trafford	7,454
	Longford	Trafford	8,217
	St. Mary's	Trafford	8,060
	Stretford	Trafford	7,300
	Urmston	Trafford	8,107
58. Wallasey BC			76,052
	Leasowe and Moreton East	Wirral	10,480
	Liscard	Wirral	10,730
	Moreton West and Saughall Massie	Wirral	10,563
	New Brighton	Wirral	10,685
	Seacombe	Wirral	9,869
	Upton	Wirral	12,112
	Wallasey	Wirral	11,613
59. Warrington North BC			76,183
	Birchwood	Warrington	7,995
	Burtonwood and Winwick	Warrington	4,993
	Culcheth, Glazebury and Croft	Warrington	8,561
	Fairfield and Howley	Warrington	8,987
	Latchford East	Warrington	6,148
	Orford	Warrington	7,435
	Poplars and Hulme	Warrington	7,342
	Poulton North	Warrington	7,256
	Poulton South	Warrington	5,187
	Rixton and Woolston	Warrington	7,283
	Westbrook	Warrington	4,996

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
60. Warrington South BC			76,806
	Appleton	Warrington	8,354
	Bewsey and Whitecross	Warrington	8,124
	Grappenhall and Thelwall	Warrington	7,659
	Great Sankey North	Warrington	4,988
	Great Sankey South	Warrington	8,046
	Hatton, Stretton and Walton	Warrington	2,513
	Latchford West	Warrington	5,626
	Lymm	Warrington	9,708
	Penketh and Cuerdley	Warrington	6,858
	Stockton Heath	Warrington	4,871
	Whittle Hall	Warrington	10,059
61. Weaver Vale CC			72,496
	Elton	Cheshire West and Chester	3,429
	Frodsham	Cheshire West and Chester	7,333
	Gowy	Cheshire West and Chester	3,263
	Hartford and Greenbank	Cheshire West and Chester	6,553
	Helsby	Cheshire West and Chester	3,960
	Kingsley	Cheshire West and Chester	3,523
	Marbury	Cheshire West and Chester	9,496
	Weaver and Cuddington	Cheshire West and Chester	10,336
	Winnington and Castle	Cheshire West and Chester	7,026
	Beechwood	Halton	2,946
	Daresbury	Halton	3,426
	Norton North	Halton	4,961
	Norton South	Halton	4,629
	Windmill Hill	Halton	1,615
62. West Cumbria CC			78,253
	Clifton	Allerdale	1,237
	Ellenborough	Allerdale	2,760
	Ewanrigg	Allerdale	2,289
	Flimby	Allerdale	1,295
	Harrington	Allerdale	2,512
	Moorclose	Allerdale	3,304
	Moss Bay	Allerdale	3,210
	Netherhall	Allerdale	2,210
	Seaton	Allerdale	3,908
	St. John's	Allerdale	4,257
	St. Michael's	Allerdale	3,506
	Stainburn	Allerdale	1,431
	Arlecdon	Copeland	1,170
	Beckermet	Copeland	2,307
	Bootle	Copeland	1,014
	Bransty	Copeland	3,777
	Cleator Moor North	Copeland	3,129
	Cleator Moor South	Copeland	2,007
	Distington	Copeland	3,053
	Egremont North	Copeland	3,208
	Egremont South	Copeland	2,832
	Ennerdale	Copeland	820
	Frizington	Copeland	2,033
	Gosforth	Copeland	1,114
	Harbour	Copeland	3,169
	Hensingham	Copeland	3,063
	Hillcrest	Copeland	2,025
	Kells	Copeland	1,956
	Mirehouse	Copeland	3,124
	Moresby	Copeland	1,065
	Sandwith	Copeland	1,942
	Seascale	Copeland	2,198
	St. Bees	Copeland	1,328

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
63. West Lancashire CC			71,897
	Ashurst	West Lancashire	4,469
	Aughton Park	West Lancashire	3,159
	Aughton and Downholland	West Lancashire	4,551
	Bickerstaffe	West Lancashire	1,644
	Birch Green	West Lancashire	2,693
	Burscough East	West Lancashire	3,348
	Burscough West	West Lancashire	3,752
	Derby	West Lancashire	4,798
	Digmoor	West Lancashire	2,738
	Halsall	West Lancashire	1,689
	Knowsley	West Lancashire	4,466
	Moorside	West Lancashire	2,442
	Newburgh	West Lancashire	1,632
	Parbold	West Lancashire	3,009
	Rufford	West Lancashire	1,637
	Scarisbrick	West Lancashire	3,028
	Scott	West Lancashire	4,189
	Skelmersdale North	West Lancashire	2,837
	Skelmersdale South	West Lancashire	4,546
	Tanhouse	West Lancashire	3,176
	Up Holland	West Lancashire	4,820
	Wrightington	West Lancashire	3,274
64. Westmorland and Lonsdale CC			72,371
	Appleby (Appleby)	Eden	1,018
	Appleby (Bongate)	Eden	1,324
	Brough	Eden	1,035
	Kirkby Stephen	Eden	2,011
	Orton with Tebay	Eden	1,061
	Ravenstonedale	Eden	753
	Warcop	Eden	1,081
	Ambleside and Grasmere	South Lakeland	2,783
	Arnside and Beetham	South Lakeland	3,394
	Burneside	South Lakeland	1,625
	Burton and Holme	South Lakeland	2,901
	Cartmel and Grange West	South Lakeland	1,531
	Coniston and Crake Valley	South Lakeland	1,264
	Crooklands	South Lakeland	1,761
	Grange North	South Lakeland	1,754
	Grange South	South Lakeland	1,488
	Hawkshead	South Lakeland	1,406
	Holker	South Lakeland	1,522
	Kendal Castle	South Lakeland	1,443
	Kendal Far Cross	South Lakeland	1,651
	Kendal Fell	South Lakeland	1,572
	Kendal Heron Hill	South Lakeland	1,504
	Kendal Highgate	South Lakeland	1,577
	Kendal Kirkland	South Lakeland	1,591
	Kendal Mintsfeet	South Lakeland	1,525
	Kendal Nether	South Lakeland	1,602
	Kendal Oxenholme and Natland	South Lakeland	1,689
	Kendal Parks	South Lakeland	1,586
	Kendal Romney	South Lakeland	1,718
	Kendal Stonecross	South Lakeland	1,586
	Kendal Strickland	South Lakeland	1,498
	Kendal Underley	South Lakeland	1,597
	Levens	South Lakeland	1,688
	Lyth Valley	South Lakeland	1,812
	Milnthorpe	South Lakeland	1,626
	Sedbergh and Kirkby Lonsdale	South Lakeland	4,705

Constituency	Ward	Local authority	Electorate
	Staveley-in-Cartmel	South Lakeland	1,550
	Staveley-in-Westmorland	South Lakeland	1,636
	Whinfell	South Lakeland	1,529
	Windermere Applethwaite and Troutbeck	South Lakeland	1,520
	Windermere Bowness North	South Lakeland	1,538
	Windermere Bowness South	South Lakeland	1,365
	Windermere Town	South Lakeland	1,551
65. Widnes and Runcorn BC			75,381
	Appleton	Halton	4,863
	Birchfield	Halton	5,292
	Broadheath	Halton	4,797
	Ditton	Halton	5,456
	Farnworth	Halton	6,415
	Grange	Halton	4,839
	Hale	Halton	1,497
	Halton Brook	Halton	4,790
	Halton Castle	Halton	4,568
	Halton Lea	Halton	4,513
	Halton View	Halton	5,181
	Heath	Halton	4,634
	Hough Green	Halton	5,155
	Kingsway	Halton	4,796
	Mersey	Halton	5,062
	Riverside	Halton	3,523
66. Wigan CC			72,733
	Aspull New Springs Whelley	Wigan	9,681
	Douglas	Wigan	9,013
	Ince	Wigan	8,270
	Pemberton	Wigan	9,120
	Shevington with Lower Ground	Wigan	8,984
	Standish with Langtree	Wigan	9,510
	Wigan Central	Wigan	8,839
	Wigan West	Wigan	9,316
67. Worsley and Eccles South CC			72,316
	Barton	Salford	8,341
	Boothstown and Ellenbrook	Salford	7,459
	Cadishead	Salford	8,015
	Irlam	Salford	6,885
	Little Hulton	Salford	8,790
	Walkden North	Salford	8,433
	Walkden South	Salford	7,884
	Winton	Salford	8,368
	Worsley	Salford	8,141
68. Wythenshawe and Sale East BC			75,919
	Baguley	Manchester	10,750
	Brooklands	Manchester	10,490
	Northenden	Manchester	11,055
	Sharston	Manchester	11,424
	Woodhouse Park	Manchester	9,924
	Brooklands	Trafford	7,672
	Priory	Trafford	7,454
	Sale Moor	Trafford	7,150