

Revised proposals for new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the **North West** region



Contents

Summary	2
Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’	2
What are the revised proposals for the North West region?	2
How to have your say	3
1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?	4
2 Background to the 2023 Review	5
The rules in the legislation	6
Timetable for our review	8
Stage one – development of initial proposals	8
Stage two – consultation on initial proposals	8
Stage three – consultation on representations received	8
Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals	9
Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations	9
3 Revised proposals for the North West	10
Sub-regions	11
Cumbria and Lancashire	13
Merseyside and Cheshire	29
Greater Manchester	42
4 How to have your say	52
How can you give us your views?	53
What do we want views on?	53
Appendix: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates	54
Glossary	80

Summary

Who we are and what we do – ‘The 2023 Review’¹

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

We are currently conducting a review on the basis of legal rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020, which will conclude with a final report and recommendations from us by 1 July 2023. The rules require there to still be 650 constituencies across the UK, but more equally distributed across the four parts of the UK, which will see the number of constituencies in England increase to 543. Each (apart from five ‘protected’ constituencies) must also contain a number of electors that is no smaller than 69,724 and no larger than 77,062 (as at the fixed date of 2 March 2020).

We published our initial proposals for the new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England on 8 June 2021 and there have been two rounds of statutory consultation relating to those to which we received over 45,000 responses. We have considered all of the comments received and taken them into account in developing our revised proposals, which we are now publishing for final consultation. For each region, a full report sets out a summary of the responses received to previous consultation on our initial proposals, our analysis of those, and the conclusions we have reached as to how the proposals should be revised as a result. The Appendix to each report contains details of the composition of each constituency we are now proposing, and maps to illustrate these can be viewed on our website or in hard copy at a local place of deposit.²

What are the revised proposals for the North West region?

We have revised the composition of 32 of the 73 constituencies we proposed in June 2021, and maintained our initial proposals for the remainder. We have revised the name of 17 of our initially proposed constituencies. Our revised proposals would leave 13 existing constituencies in the North West region wholly unchanged, and five unchanged except to realign constituency boundaries with local government ward boundaries.³

As it is not always possible to allocate whole numbers of constituencies to individual counties or unitary authorities, we sometimes group these into sub-regions, meaning some constituencies cross county or unitary authority boundaries. After consideration of the responses to the sub-regions in our initial proposals, our revised proposals are based on unchanged sub-regions, as follows: Cumbria and Lancashire⁴ (allocated

¹ Further details about the BCE and 2023 Review are published on our website: <https://boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk/>

² A list of places of deposit is published on our website (as above).

³ Where the Order to make such wards was made by 1 December 2020.

⁴ Comprising the county of Lancashire, and the two unitary authorities of Blackpool, and Blackburn with Darwen, hereafter referred to as Lancashire.

20 constituencies); Merseyside and Cheshire⁵ (allocated 26 constituencies); and Greater Manchester (allocated 27 constituencies). 30 constituencies would cross local authority boundaries (three more than our initial proposals): four would contain parts of more than two local authorities (equal to our initial proposals).

We are proposing comprehensive change in both Cumbria and the south of Lancashire, reflecting the weight and quality of evidence received in opposition to the initial proposals. There are very few revisions across Merseyside, aside from the introduction of two split wards. The changes in Cheshire centre around Northwich, Middlewich and Winsford. The west of Greater Manchester has a small number of revisions, with more significant reconfiguration of constituencies proposed in Tameside and the east of the City of Manchester.

We are proposing four constituencies that would cross county boundaries: Morecambe and Lunesdale (Cumbria and Lancashire); Southport (Lancashire and Merseyside); Ellesmere Port and Bromborough; and Widnes and Halewood (both Cheshire and Merseyside). We are proposing no changes to the initially proposed composition of Southport, and Ellesmere Port and Bromborough constituencies (although proposing a name change for the latter). We propose to split the Whiston & Cronton ward in the proposed Widnes and Halewood constituency. The proposed Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency is similar to the Morecambe and South Lakeland constituency in the initial proposals, but the Skerton East and Skerton West wards would be united within the Lancaster and Wyre constituency. Morecambe and Lunesdale would contain the Sedbergh ward, and both named Lune Valley wards, but no longer include any part of the Bowness and Levens ward.

We are proposing to split seven wards across the region, in: Knowsley; Sefton; South Lakeland; Warrington; Wigan; and Wirral.

How to have your say

We are consulting on our revised proposals for a four-week period, from 8 November 2022 to 5 December 2022. We encourage everyone to use this final opportunity to contribute to the design of the new constituencies – the more views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be when we make our final recommendations and report to Parliament. Our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk has more information about our revised proposals and how to give us your views. You can also follow us on Twitter [@BCEReviews](https://twitter.com/BCEReviews) or at facebook.com/BCEReviews.

⁵ Comprising the unitary authorities of Cheshire East, Cheshire West and Chester, and the boroughs of Halton, and Warrington, hereafter together referred to as Cheshire.

1 What is the Boundary Commission for England?

- 1.1 As already mentioned, BCE is an independent and impartial non-departmental public body, which is required to review Parliamentary constituency boundaries in England. We must conduct a review of all the constituencies in England every eight years. Our role is to make recommendations for new constituency boundaries, which are then made by Statutory Instrument and used at the next General Election.
- 1.2 The Chair of the Commission is the Speaker of the House of Commons, but – as an MP themselves – by convention they do not actively participate in the work of the Commission. The Deputy Chair and two further Commissioners determine its policies within the legislative framework, oversee the progression of a Review, and take decisions on the actual proposals and recommendations for new constituency boundaries. Further information about the Commissioners can be found on our regular website.

You can find further information on our regular website at www.boundarycommissionforengland.independent.gov.uk, or on our consultation portal at www.bcereviews.org.uk. You can also contact us with any general enquiries by emailing information@boundarycommissionengland.gov.uk, or by calling 020 7276 1102.

2 Background to the 2023 Review

- 2.1 We are currently conducting a review of Parliamentary constituency boundaries on the basis of rules most recently updated by Parliament in 2020.⁶ These rules require us to make the number of electors in each constituency more equal. This report covers only the work of the Boundary Commission for England (there are separate Commissions for Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales) 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. When our recommendations are accepted, they are then used for the first time at the next General Election following their acceptance.
- 2.3 The legislation states that there will be 650 Parliamentary constituencies covering the UK – the same as the current number, but a statutory formula now distributes that total proportionately across the four parts of the UK. England has therefore been allocated 543 constituencies for the 2023 Review, ten more than there are currently. There are also other rules that the Commission has regard to when conducting the review – a full set of the rules can be found in our Guide to the 2023 Review,⁷ but they are also summarised later in this chapter. Most significantly, the rules require every constituency we recommend to contain no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062.
- 2.4 This is a significant change to the old rules under which Parliamentary boundary reviews took place, in which achieving as close to the average number of electors in each constituency was an aim, but there was no statutory fixed minimum and maximum number of electors. This, together with the passage of time since constituencies were last updated (based on data from 2000), means that in England, existing constituencies currently range from 53,210 to 109,246 electors. Achieving a more even distribution of electors in every constituency across England, together with the increase in the total allocation of constituencies, means that a significant amount of change to the existing map of constituencies is inevitable.
- 2.5 When implemented, the final recommendations that we will make 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 have, where practicable, attempted to limit the extent of such change, having regard to the statutory factors and the need to create the best possible pattern for constituencies as a whole. Under the legislation, we have a challenging job in conducting a review of constituency boundaries that is necessarily going to result, in many places, in constituencies that are unfamiliar to the public. Nevertheless, we have conducted the review in a rigorous and thorough fashion.

⁶ The Parliamentary Constituencies Act 2020, available at www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2020/25/contents

⁷ Available at www.bcereviews.org.uk

- 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 relating to our initial proposals, the careful consideration of that evidence by the Secretariat and our Assistant Commissioners, and the best judgement of the three Commissioners. We are 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 final pattern of constituencies to recommend to Parliament next year. There are 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 particularly looking for further evidence before we finalise our recommendations. In many other 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, but we will not be assisted by a 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 aware that very often a change that may seem obvious to make in one constituency necessarily requires far less attractive alterations in one or more neighbouring constituencies, and sometimes the consequential alterations reverberate through a whole chain of constituencies.
- 2.7 Our Guide to the 2023 Review contains further detailed background information, and explains all of the policies and procedures that we are following in conducting the review. We encourage anyone wishing to respond to the review to read this document, which will give them a greater understanding of the rules and constraints placed on the Commission, especially if they are intending to comment on our revised proposals and/or make their own counter-proposals.

The rules in the legislation

- 2.8 As well as the primary rule that constituencies must have no fewer than 69,724 electors and no more than 77,062, the legislation also states that, when deciding on boundaries, the Commission may take into account:
- special geographical considerations, including in particular the size, shape and accessibility of a constituency;
 - local government boundaries which existed, or were prospective, on 1 December 2020;
 - boundaries of existing constituencies;
 - any local ties that would be broken by changes in constituencies; and
 - the inconveniences attendant on such changes.

- 2.9** In relation to local government boundaries in particular, it should be noted that for a given area, where we choose to take account of local government boundaries, if there are prospective boundaries (as at 1 December 2020), it is those, rather than existing boundaries, of which account may be taken. This is a significant change to the former legislation, which referred only to the local government boundaries as they actually existed on the relevant date.
- 2.10** Our initial proposals for the North West (and the accompanying maps) were therefore based on local government boundaries that existed, or – where relevant – were prospective, on 1 December 2020. Our revised proposals contained within this report continue to be based on those boundaries. Our Guide to the 2023 Review outlines further our policy on how, and to what extent, we take into account local government boundaries. We have used the existing and prospective wards as at 1 December 2020 of unitary authorities, and borough and district councils (in areas where there is also a county council) as the basic building blocks for our proposals.
- 2.11** In a number of existing constituencies, changes to local government wards since constituencies were last updated (in 2010) have resulted in the new ward effectively being split, between the constituency the old ward was wholly a part of, and at least one other existing constituency. As part of our proposals, we will by default seek to realign the boundaries of constituencies with up-to-date ward boundaries, thus reuniting wards that are currently divided between existing constituencies. In places where there has been only a minor change to a ward, this may see an existing constituency boundary change only very slightly, to realign with the new ward. However, where wards in an area have been changed more significantly, this may result in the area covered by the new ward becoming part of a different constituency than the one much of that area was in previously.
- 2.12** Although the 2023 Review of Parliamentary constituencies will inevitably result in significant change, we have also taken into account the boundaries of existing constituencies so far as we can. We tried to retain existing constituencies as part of our initial proposals wherever possible, as long as the other factors could also be satisfied. This, however, proved difficult. Our initial proposals retained 15% of the existing constituencies in the North West as wholly unchanged, and a further 3% changed only to realign with changed boundaries of their component wards.
- 2.13** 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 might put a higher value on retaining existing constituency boundaries over the other factors in the rules, the legislation does not give any of these precedence over another, and the Commission therefore considers that its task is to seek to strike the best balance of all the factors in each area, within the numerical constraints.

- 2.14 Our proposals are based on the nine English regions as defined in the legislation; a description of the extent of each region also appears in the Guide to the 2023 Review. This report relates to the North West region. There are eight other separate reports containing our revised proposals for the other regions. At the very beginning of the 2023 Review we decided, in agreement with all the qualifying political parties, to use these regions as discrete areas within which to undertake our work. You can find more details in our Guide to the 2023 Review 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, very compelling reasons would need to be given to persuade us to depart from the region-based approach.
- 2.15 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, continue to use the regional boundaries as the basis for proposals for constituencies.

Timetable for our review

Stage one – development of initial proposals

- 2.16 We began this review in January 2021. We published electorate data from 2 March 2020 (the relevant date specified by the legislation) for each local government ward in England, including – where relevant – wards that were prospective on 1 December 2020. The electorate data was provided by individual local electoral registration officers and the Office for National Statistics. These figures are available on our website. The Commission then considered the statutory factors outlined above and drew up the initial proposals. We published our initial proposals for consultation for each of England’s nine regions on 8 June 2021.

Stage two – consultation on initial proposals

- 2.17 We consulted on our initial proposals for eight weeks, from 8 June 2021 until 2 August 2021. We received over 34,000 discrete written representations across the country as a whole, including over 5,025 unique written representations relating to the North West. We are grateful to all those who took the time and effort to read and respond to our initial proposals.

Stage three – consultation on representations received

- 2.18 The legislation required us to publish all the responses we received on our initial proposals. We published the representations on 7 February 2022 ahead of a six-week ‘secondary consultation’ period, which took place from 22 February 2022 until 4 April 2022. The purpose of the secondary consultation was for people to

see what others said in response to our initial proposals, and to make comments on those views, for example by countering an argument, or by supporting and reinforcing what others said. We received over 10,000 unique written representations across the country as a whole, including almost 1,800 unique representations relating to the North West. We also hosted between two and five public hearings in each region. We heard more than 140 oral representations at the five public hearings in the North West. We are grateful to all those who attended and spoke at our public hearings.

Stage four – development and publication of revised proposals

2.19 As we detail in chapter 3 below, 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 8 November 2022, we are publishing this report – *Revised proposals for new constituency boundaries in the North West region* – alongside eight others, one for each of the other regions in England. We are consulting on our revised proposals for the statutory four-week period, which closes on 5 December 2022. Unlike the secondary consultation period, there is no provision in the legislation for further public hearings. Chapter 4 outlines how you can contribute during this consultation period. It should be noted that this will be the final opportunity for people to contribute their views during the 2023 Review.

Stage five – development and publication of the final report and recommendations

2.20 Once the consultation on revised proposals has closed on 5 December 2022, we will consider all the representations received at this stage, and throughout the review, before determining our final recommendations. The recommendations will be set out in a report to the Speaker of the House of Commons, who will lay it before Parliament, at which time we will also publish the report. The legislation states that we should submit that report to the Speaker by 1 July 2023. Further details about what the Government must then do with our recommendations in order to implement them are contained in our Guide to the 2023 Review.

2.21 Throughout each consultation period, 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 After the consultation on the initial proposals in 2021, we arranged for the appointment of two Assistant Commissioners for the North West region – Andy Brennan QPM and David Brown QFSM – 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: 3-4 March 2022
 - Liverpool: 7-8 March 2022
 - Chester: 10-11 March 2022
 - Preston: 14-15 March 2022
 - Kendal: 17-18 March 2022
- 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 very 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 views and 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; and
 - 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 in the Appendix to this report.
- 3.5 Throughout this chapter, where we refer to a respondent’s response, we do so by using the reference number, i.e. BCE-12345 (we only include an individual’s name if they gave permission for it to be published). This reference number corresponds with the representations that can be found on our consultation website at www.bcereviews.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.

Sub-regions

- 3.6 In seeking to produce 73 constituencies within the permitted electorate range, at the initial proposals we considered whether local authorities could be usefully grouped into sub-regions. Our approach in attempting to group local authority areas together in sub-regions was based both on trying to respect county boundaries wherever possible, and in achieving (where we could) obvious practical groupings such as those dictated in part by the geography of the area. We sought to respect, where we could, the external boundaries of local authorities.
- 3.7 The distribution of electors across the five ceremonial counties of the North West region is such that allocating a whole number of constituencies to each, while keeping each constituency within the permitted electorate quota, was not possible. The initial proposals sought to accommodate as many counties as possible as sub-regions in their own right. Greater Manchester is, however, the only county within the North West region that can stand alone as a sub-region without causing disruption and breaking local ties elsewhere in the region. Cumbria's electorate of 389,717 results in a mathematical entitlement of 5.31 constituencies. This number is too large for the county to be allocated five whole constituencies, and too few for six, so it is therefore necessary for Cumbria to be paired with another county: the only pairing that respects regional and national boundaries was with Lancashire.
- 3.8 The electorate of Merseyside, of 1,049,947, gives a mathematical entitlement of 14.31 constituencies, which makes it extremely difficult to allocate a whole number of constituencies to the area without causing significant disruption. In determining with which area Merseyside should be paired, it was noted that the electorate in the Metropolitan Borough of Wirral, at 244,680, gave the borough a mathematical entitlement of 3.33 constituencies. This means that there could not be a whole number of constituencies wholly contained within the Wirral borough boundary. It is therefore necessary either for a constituency to cross between the Wirral and the Cheshire West and Chester unitary authority, or for a constituency to span the River Mersey between the Wirral and the City of Liverpool. In previous reviews, the crossing of the River Mersey had been strongly opposed, so the initial proposals crossed the Wirral boundary with Cheshire West and Chester, thereby treating Merseyside and Cheshire as a sub-region.

- 3.9** Despite effectively treating Merseyside as a separate sub-region to Lancashire, we did propose one constituency that would cross the county – and sub-region – boundary: it would combine four wards of the District of West Lancashire with the Merseyside town of Southport. This in effect allows the entire North West region to be considered as a single large review area, with the exception of Greater Manchester. Although this sub-regional and county crossing was not required by the sizes of the electorates, we considered that this allowed us to better reflect both local ties and the boundaries of existing constituencies, and that it therefore enabled a more appropriate pattern of constituencies across much of the North West region.
- 3.10** This approach was broadly accepted by those responding to the consultations as being desirable in order to improve the prospective constituency pattern across both Merseyside and Lancashire, and is a significant feature of both the national Labour Party's (BCE-79505) and Conservative Party's (BCE-86369) counter-proposals. The proposal to cross the county boundary was, however, opposed in some responses from residents of the Ainsdale ward, who argued that the ward is an intrinsic part of Southport and should therefore be included within the Southport constituency (e.g. BCE-90826, and Stephen Jowett – BCE-77635).
- 3.11** We also received some counter-proposals that would not cross between Merseyside and Lancashire at Southport, such as Jonathan Stansby (BCE-59207), and John Bryant (BCE-70325), who, along with BCE-59246 and BCE-75915, proposed a constituency that would instead cross elsewhere between the two counties. Jonathan Stansby and Oliver Raven (BCE-85367) also proposed constituencies that would cross the boundaries of Greater Manchester, and therefore use no sub-regions at all.
- 3.12** While the Assistant Commissioners acknowledged the opposition in the views expressed in responses from Ainsdale, and the existence of some benefits in each of the alternative approaches mentioned above, they also considered that these alternate sub-region groupings would cause greater disruption to existing constituency boundaries and local ties across the region. For this reason, they did not recommend changing the sub-region groupings for the revised proposals. We agree with their recommendation and therefore do not propose any adjustments to the sub-regions.

Cumbria and Lancashire

- 3.13** There are currently six constituencies in Cumbria, none of which have electorates that are within the permitted range, so none can be retained unchanged. Furthermore, only five constituencies can be wholly allocated within the county boundary, necessitating one cross-county boundary constituency, the larger part of which would be within Lancashire. Each of the six major towns in Cumbria forms the focus of a current constituency, with its own hinterland. By necessity, two of these have to be included within the same constituency. At the initial proposals, we judged Kendal and Penrith to be the most suitable pair to be included together, as they are both historic market towns with a similar character.
- 3.14** The electorate of the City of Carlisle local authority is too large for a constituency coterminous with the authority boundaries. In our initial proposals, the Dalston & Burgh ward was included in the proposed Workington constituency as an 'orphan' ward, with all the remaining Carlisle District wards forming the Carlisle constituency. The qualifying political parties all agreed with the initial proposals concerning the proposed Carlisle constituency and acknowledged that, despite its strong links to the city, the Dalston & Burgh ward was best placed to not be included within the constituency. At the Kendal public hearing, John Stevenson, MP for Carlisle, echoed this view and praised the logic of the initial proposals in this area (BCE-98101). This was the only aspect of the initial proposals within Cumbria that resulted in broad agreement from the qualifying political parties. There was, however, opposition from local residents, citing the distance from the Dalston & Burgh ward to Workington (BCE-55237, BCE-79264). There were also proposals to keep the Dalston & Burgh ward within the Carlisle constituency, at the expense of the Brampton & Fellside ward (BCE-52530), or to split the Dalston & Burgh ward in some way, so that more electors could remain with the Carlisle constituency (BCE-66967, and Brian Dodd – BCE-57351).
- 3.15** Our Assistant Commissioners visited the Dalston & Burgh ward, and observed that, although the ward clearly looks to and is well connected to Carlisle, the village of Dalston is separated from the city by a large area of rural land. There also appeared to be no change of character between the Dalston and Burgh ward and the northern elements of Allerdale borough. These reasons, and the cross-party consensus that the initial proposals were the most reasonable option for a Carlisle constituency, informed the Assistant Commissioners' decision to recommend no change to the proposed Carlisle constituency. We agree with their recommendations and therefore propose that the Carlisle constituency be the same as at initial proposals.

- 3.16** At the initial proposals stage, we proposed a Workington constituency that we judged would be more closely aligned with the boundaries of Allerdale district than the existing constituency. This would include all the wards of Allerdale district, except the Crummock & Derwent Valley, and Keswick wards, and would also include the Dalston & Burgh ward from the City of Carlisle.
- 3.17** The initially proposed Westmorland and Eden constituency would include the entirety of Eden district, and the following South Lakeland District wards: Kirkby Lonsdale; Kendal Rural; Sedbergh; and the five wards comprising the town of Kendal itself. We then proposed that the Barrow and Furness constituency be extended eastwards, across the Leven Estuary, to include both the Cartmel and Grange wards, with no part of the Broughton & Coniston ward. It was considered that this arrangement would allow for a more practicable configuration of constituencies across Cumbria, without fundamentally altering the nature of the existing Barrow and Furness constituency.
- 3.18** The proposed Copeland and the Western Lakes constituency would then be broadly similar to the existing Copeland constituency, retaining the Crummock & Derwent Valley, and the Keswick wards, but would also include the Ambleside & Grasmere, Broughton & Coniston, and Windermere wards. In order to maintain the entirety of Lake Windermere within a single constituency, and to avoid dividing the communities of Windermere and Bowness-on-Windermere, the initial proposals would split the Bowness & Levens ward, such that the westernmost part of this ward, (which contains Bowness-on-Windermere and the southern expanse of Lake Windermere) would be included within the Copeland and the Western Lakes constituency.
- 3.19** The remainder of the Bowness & Levens ward would be included with the Arnside & Milnthorpe, and Burton & Crooklands wards in the proposed Morecambe and South Lakeland constituency, which would cross the Cumbria and Lancashire county boundary. In the south of this constituency, we considered the River Lune largely forms the point of division between the town of Morecambe and the City of Lancaster, but proposed to include the Skerton East ward in the Lancaster constituency.
- 3.20** We received over 900 representations from across Cumbria, the vast majority of which objected to the initial proposals. Many of these representations objected to the entire initial proposals for Cumbria, rather than to specific constituencies.
- 3.21** The Conservative Party (BCE-86369) supported the initial proposals in their entirety, barring name change recommendations. Further evidence in support of this position was provided by Councillor Chris Whiteside, Chairman of the North West Region Conservative Party (BCE-74137). Cllr Whiteside believed that the initial proposals would better reflect both local government ties and the existing constituencies across Cumbria than did any alternatives provided. At the Kendal public hearing, Cllr Whiteside further argued that despite it being undoubtedly the

weakest in the proposed configuration, the proposed Copeland and the Western Lakes constituency was better than at least one constituency in every alternative provided (BCE-98090). We received other evidence in support of the initial proposals, including the north-south orientation of Cumbria's routeways being matched by the constituency pattern proposed (BCE-75232). Mark Jenkinson, MP for Workington, wrote (BCE-82718) and spoke at the Kendal public hearing (BCE-98106) in support of the proposed amendments to the current constituency, stating that they represented a 'strong and coherent proposal bringing together areas of existing community, travel for work, travel for leisure, and existing transport links'.

- 3.22** There were calls to change the name of the proposed Westmorland and Eden constituency to Penrith, Eden and Kendal (BCE-74943), but also acknowledgements that there were good transport links between the two towns (Lorna Baker – BCE-60527). Trudy Harrison, MP for Copeland (BCE-98116), described the proposed Copeland and the Western Lakes constituency as 'geographically coherent', and asserted that the Lake District, although undoubtedly a 'challenge', was ringed by connecting roads, so the issues of transport access were negligible. This view was supported by Cllr Whiteside who argued that although there were numerous representations citing issues of connectivity between Whitehaven and Windermere, each part of the proposed constituency would be well connected to its neighbouring settlements (BCE-98090). The proposed Barrow and Furness constituency also received some support, with Simon Fell, MP for Barrow and Furness (BCE-86343) supporting it in its entirety. Similarly, despite assertions that the Cartmel Peninsula has nothing in common with Barrow (for example BCE-80018), John Walsh (BCE-98113) informed us at the Kendal public hearing that Barrow and the Cartmel Peninsula were both a part of the historic County Palatine of Lancaster, which stopped at the Duddon.

- 3.23** The Liberal Democrats (BCE-80878, BCE-94345, and BCE-97971), the Labour Party nationally (BCE-79505) and locally (BCE-79182), and a large number of members of the public, provided a significant amount of evidence that the initial proposals had little to no regard to the physical geography or communities within Cumbria. Brendan Sweeney on behalf of the Cumbrian Labour Parties (BCE-79182), and others quoted sections of the BCE's 2013 Revised Proposals report within their representations, as the initial proposals in 2011 broadly correlated to those of this review: 'There was also widespread concern that the Commission had fundamentally misunderstood the geographical and demographic characteristics of the sub-region, such that its proposals for each of the new constituencies, with the exception of Carlisle...were flawed and should not be allowed to stand. The strength of feeling on this was strong, ranging from surprise to anger to incredulity...Physically, the mountains are such a barrier that it is not sensible to try to embrace them in the ways proposed by the commission'. While the 2023 Review is a fresh review, and the numerical criteria we are working to are different, issues of physical geography and local ties remain relevant important considerations when they are shown to remain the case, as was argued here.
- 3.24** The counter-proposal from the Liberal Democrats (BCE-80878) similarly made clear their concerns with the initial proposals, stating: 'It is clear that the highest mountain range in England provides a significant border between communities, and that the UNESCO World Heritage Site status does not confer any community ties in return'. Richard Marbrow of the Liberal Democrats, who spoke at both the Manchester and Kendal public hearings (BCE-97971, BCE-98095), provided further evidence that the configuration of constituencies in the initial proposals would be inadequate in reference to both physical geography and community ties. These views were echoed by both Brendan and Tom Sweeney (BCE-98091, BCE-98112) at the Kendal public hearing. Tim Farron, MP for Westmorland and Lonsdale (BCE-98093), highlighted that it was as easy to get from Windermere to Greater Manchester, Scotland and Wales as it was to get to Whitehaven, and that the Copeland and the Western Lakes constituency in particular bore no relation to community ties or the realities of physical geography. The counter proposals provided by the Liberal Democrats (BCE-80878) and Brendan Sweeney on behalf of the Cumbrian Labour Parties (BCE-79182) both followed the same fundamental approach, which differed significantly from the initial proposals. Instead of dividing the existing Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency, the majority of that constituency would be retained intact, with no inclusion of wards to the east of the Lake District with Whitehaven or Workington. These two towns would instead be included in the same constituency, while in the north of the county a constituency would stretch from Alston in the east to the Solway Firth in the west, including the town of Penrith, but none of the southern part of the Eden Valley.

- 3.25** The Westmorland and Lonsdale Green Party (BCE-67176) also highlighted issues with the proposed Westmorland and Eden constituency, citing poor public transport and accessibility between Penrith and Kendal, the two main population centres. In a similar vein, at the Kendal public hearing, Andy Connell (BCE-98108) asserted that Kendal and Penrith have never before been in a constituency together.
- 3.26** The Assistant Commissioners considered that there were, in effect, only two solutions for the other constituencies in Cumbria, and their recommendations would have to be based on which of these seemingly mutually exclusive approaches to take across the remainder of Cumbria (aside from Carlisle). They perceived these two main options to be fundamentally a difficult choice between different statutory factors: the initial proposals arguably stronger with regard to respecting existing local government boundaries, while the alternative put forward by the Liberal Democrats and Cumbrian Labour Party would arguably be stronger in relation to community ties. The Assistant Commissioners considered that neither approach could be reasonably weighed over the other in regard to the existing constituencies, due to the scale of change in both, which required either the wholesale reconfiguration of the Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency (as initially proposed), or at least one constituency having to stretch east-west across the whole county (in the alternative).
- 3.27** The Assistant Commissioners considered that none of the counter-proposals received would be without disadvantages, but in view of the evidence received, neither were the initial proposals. They felt sufficient evidence had been provided that the initial proposals might not be the option to best respect the statutory criteria. Furthermore, consulting on a different pattern of constituencies would be more likely to elicit further evidence on the merits of both the initial proposals and/or the revised proposals. The Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended to us a pattern of constituencies that was a mixture of those proposed by the Liberal Democrats and Cumbrian Labour parties, as detailed below.
- 3.28** In the south west of the county, the Assistant Commissioners recommended that the Broughton & Coniston ward be split along the boundary between the existing Barrow and Furness constituency, and the existing Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency. Splitting the ward here retains an existing constituency boundary, and is required for the alternative scheme to be adopted. Although splitting the Black Combe & Scafell ward was also proposed (Brendan Sweeney – BCE-79182, and Michael Heaslip – BCE-84703), the Assistant Commissioners did not feel that this was required to create an acceptable scheme for Cumbria, and that it did not provide enough benefits to justify a further ward split.

- 3.29 As the existing Barrow and Furness constituency is under the permitted electorate range, the Black Combe & Scafell ward, and the Millom ward, would be included to bring it within range. Despite the fact this constituency would cross three local authorities and contain a split ward, the Assistant Commissioners considered that the evidence received identified a significant community of interest between the areas north and west of the Duddon Estuary and the Furness Peninsula (BCE-79182, BCE-98091, and BCE-98112). The northern boundary of this constituency would follow the River Mite as far as Eskdale, where it would then follow the ridgelines of Illgill Head, Scafell Pike, and Great End.
- 3.30 The Assistant Commissioners recommended that the remainder of the split Broughton & Coniston ward should sit within a proposed Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency, as it is currently. This constituency would contain all the wards from the South Lakeland District that are included in the existing constituency, with the exception of Arnside & Milnthorpe, Burton & Crooklands, and Sedbergh. It would also include all the wards within the Eden District that are to the south of the town of Penrith, together with Dacre, Greystoke, and Ullswater. Richard Marbrow of the Liberal Democrats provided evidence (BCE-97971, BCE-98095) that the River Eamont south of Penrith formed the historic boundary between the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland, and would therefore be a suitable and identifiable constituency boundary in this area.
- 3.31 While noting the very balanced decision to be made between the initial proposals for these parts of Cumbria and the alternative put forward by the Liberal Democrats and Cumbrian Labour Party, we agree with the Assistant Commissioners' recommendations and reasoning. We consider that our revised proposals will address many of the objections to the initial proposals in this area, as they avoid a division of the South Lakeland local authority and restore the majority of the existing Westmorland and Lonsdale constituency, in particular taking greater account of the local ties highlighted in the evidence received.
- 3.32 The Assistant Commissioners then recommended a Whitehaven and Workington constituency that would contain the entirety of Copeland borough, aside from the two wards in the Barrow and Furness constituency (Black Combe & Scafell, and Millom). It would also include both the Crummock & Derwent Valley and Keswick wards, which are part of the existing Copeland constituency. The Whitehaven component would comprise the remaining Allerdale borough wards south of the River Derwent. During their site visit the Assistant Commissioners observed Whitehaven and Workington to be well connected towns with a similar character, and therefore considered that there was justification for their inclusion in a constituency together. The proposed name would reference both towns – as the clear population centres – arranged alphabetically, as they are of a comparable size. We agree with these recommendations and therefore propose a Whitehaven and Workington constituency as described.

- 3.33** As discussed previously, the Dalston & Burgh ward cannot be included within the proposed Carlisle constituency. As such, the Assistant Commissioners recommended that it form part of a Penrith and Solway constituency, which would include all the remaining wards in the Eden valley not mentioned above, as well as the 15 most northern wards of the Borough of Allerdale. In the west of Allerdale, the constituency's southern boundary would be the River Derwent as far as Broughton Cross, where the constituency boundary would then follow the ward boundaries to the south of Cockermouth, and the north of Keswick. The Assistant Commissioners considered that the recommended constituency boundaries would be well defined, it would have a common rural character, and on their site visit to the area they considered that the road connections were adequate and would not present any obstacle. This constituency would include areas from three local authorities, and the Dalston and Burgh ward would be an 'orphan' (as it was in the initial proposals).
- 3.34** The Assistant Commissioners did note that this constituency would also stretch east to west across Cumbria, from Alston to the Solway Firth, an outcome that the initial proposals specifically sought to avoid, but they considered that it allowed for the formulation of constituencies across Cumbria overall that would better reflect the community identity evidence received. Similarly, Alston was cited as an outlier in Cumbria, more closely aligned with Northumberland (BCE-82216), and whichever Cumbria constituency it is placed within might therefore be claimed to have poor community ties. Richard Marbrow pointed out at both the Manchester and Kendal public hearings (BCE-97971, BCE-98095) that both Alston and Wigton are already in the same constituency as Penrith, and the Liberal Democrats argued that their Penrith and Solway constituency (which this would largely match) arguably would not extend very far west beyond Wigton in geographic terms. The Assistant Commissioners also noted that the existing Penrith and The Borders constituency contains wards from three local authorities, so this recommended successor would not be radically different. Having reviewed the evidence and counter proposals received, we agree with the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioners for a Penrith and Solway constituency as described.
- 3.35** While our revised proposals for Cumbria may initially seem to be worse than the initial proposals with regard to local government boundaries, we are conscious of the incoming unitary authorities for Cumbria, which will replace the current authorities, as highlighted in BCE-84457. This will mitigate these concerns to a large extent. Following the introduction of the new authorities (scheduled to take place in April 2023, shortly before our final recommendations are due to be published), two of the revised proposed constituencies would cross the boundary of the two unitary authority boundaries. By way of comparison, the initial proposals would cross that boundary once.

- 3.36** We consider that our revised proposals for Cumbria accurately reflect the significant numbers and nature of the representations and evidence received, with a demonstrable improvement to community ties in the South Lakeland area in particular. These proposals remove the need to split the Bowness & Levens ward, and there would remain a single split ward in Cumbria (Broughton & Coniston). We further consider that the only realistic and acceptable alternative position would be to revert to the initial proposals, with some alternative names for some of the constituencies, as proposed by the Conservative Party (BCE-86369).
- 3.37** The requirement for a cross-county constituency between Cumbria and Lancashire was accepted by three of the qualifying parties, and all would include Arnside & Milnthorpe, and Burton & Crooklands as the two wards from Cumbria to be included in the Morecambe based constituency. The Liberal Democrats and Labour Party would not include any part of the Bowness & Levens ward in a cross-county constituency, as their proposals would not require this ward to be split.
- 3.38** Under the initial proposals, the Skerton East and Skerton West wards would be included in different constituencies: the proposed Lancaster, and Morecambe and South Lakeland constituencies respectively. The Conservative Party (BCE-86369), David Morris, MP for the existing Morecambe and Lunesdale constituency, (BCE-86598), and the petition that he organised (BCE-86601), called for the two wards of Skerton East and Skerton West to be united within the Morecambe and South Lakeland constituency. Conversely, Cat Smith, MP for Lancaster and Fleetwood (BCE-71660), and the Labour Party (BCE-79505) also proposed that the wards should be together, but within the Lancaster constituency. This latter approach was widely supported (BCE-78437, BCE-87237).
- 3.39** Under the initial proposals, the Lancaster constituency would be significantly different from the existing Lancaster and Fleetwood constituency. In addition to the Skerton East ward, the Upper Lune Valley ward was proposed to be included within this constituency, and although the proposed constituency would still extend into the Borough of Wyre, no part of it would extend across the River Wyre into Fleetwood. We received support for Fleetwood no longer being included in the same constituency as Lancaster (BCE-55949, BCE-55952).
- 3.40** The Assistant Commissioners recommended to us that the Arnside & Milnthorpe, Burton & Crooklands, and Sedbergh wards should be the Cumbrian component of the constituency that would cross between Cumbria and Lancashire. They also recognised the widespread agreement that the Skerton East and Skerton West wards should be included in the same constituency, and that most respondents felt that they were more part of Lancaster than Morecambe. During the Assistant Commissioners' visit to the area to observe the links for themselves, they noted

the 'Welcome to the City of Lancaster' sign upon entering Skerton, and judged that the A683 formed a clear boundary between Skerton and Morecambe. There was similar evidence from the petition organised by David Morris MP (BCE-86601), with 120 of the 121 signatories identifying as residents of Skerton saying that Skerton was part of Lancaster, not Morecambe. In order to accommodate the inclusion of the Skerton East and Skerton West wards within the Lancaster constituency, the Assistant Commissioners recommended that the Lower Lune Valley ward be included in the Morecambe and South Lakeland constituency in exchange. Noting that the River Lune extended all the way across the boundary between Lancashire and Cumbria to Sedbergh, they recommended to us that the existing constituency name of Morecambe and Lunesdale was still appropriate and that it should now be retained.

- 3.41** With regard to Lancaster, Sir Robert Atkins (BCE-98119) and BCE-86594 noted that the constituency would contain a geographically larger component from the Wyre borough than currently, and therefore proposed that its name be changed to reflect this. The Assistant Commissioners concurred, and therefore recommended that the name of the constituency be changed to Lancaster and Wyre. Despite evidence provided by Sir Robert Atkins (BCE-98119), Alison Metcalf (BCE-98122), and Peter Pimbley (BCE-98123) at the Preston public hearing that the Elswick and Little Ecclestone ward should be included within the same constituency as the Great Ecclestone ward, the Assistant Commissioners were not minded to recommend this option. This was because it would result in both an orphan ward (Elswick and Little Ecclestone), and the proposed Lancaster and Wyre constituency would contain elements of three local authorities, with neither outcome being required. We agree with the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioners both with regard to the composition of the two constituencies in question, and their recommendation to rename them Morecambe and Lunesdale, and Lancaster and Wyre respectively.

- 3.42 Our initial proposals for a Blackpool North and Fleetwood constituency would contain the settlements of Fleetwood, Cleveleys and Thornton from the Borough of Wyre, and five wards from the Blackpool unitary authority. The existing Blackpool South constituency has an electorate of 56,887, which is significantly below the permitted electorate range, so we proposed that the Blackpool South constituency would contain the entirety of the existing constituency, and extend north to include the Claremont, Layton, Park, and Warbreck wards. The constituency would remain entirely within Blackpool unitary authority. A relatively minor change was proposed to the existing Fylde constituency: in order to bring it within the permitted electorate range, the Borough of Wyre wards of Breck, Hardhorn with High Cross, and Tithebarn were proposed to be included in the constituency. These three wards comprise the town of Poulton-le-Fylde, which the initial proposals sought to avoid dividing. This would also enable the Fylde constituency to no longer include wards from the City of Preston. We received representations both in support (BCE-85183, and Mark Menzies – BCE-82433) and opposition to our proposals here. The majority of the opposition came from residents of the Carleton ward who wished to be included with Poulton-le-Fylde (BCE-56143, BCE-59846).
- 3.43 Overall, the initial proposals were not particularly contentious in this area and relatively few representations were received concerning these proposed constituencies, with proportionally little opposition. Our Assistant Commissioners therefore considered that there was no justification for change in this area, and recommended that these three constituencies be unchanged from the initial proposals. We agree and therefore propose the composition and names of the three constituencies of Blackpool North and Fleetwood, Blackpool South, and Fylde remain unchanged from initial proposals.
- 3.44 The proposed Preston constituency would include the majority of the city of Preston, including the Cadley, Garrison, Greyfriars, and Sharoe Green wards, which were previously in the Wyre and Preston North constituency. However, the entirety of the city of Preston could not be contained within one constituency. To bring the constituency within the permitted electorate range, the two City of Preston wards of Fishwick & Frenchwood, and Ribbleton would be included in the significantly reconfigured Ribble Valley constituency, along with the Preston Rural East, and Preston Rural North wards. This arrangement would result in the vast majority of the town of Bamber Bridge no longer being included within a constituency centred on the Ribble Valley. The proposed Ribble Valley constituency itself would include all except three wards from the Ribble Valley borough: the Billington & Langho ward, the East Whalley, Read & Simonstone ward, and the Whalley & Painter Wood ward. These three wards would be included in the proposed Hyndburn constituency, with the entirety of the Hyndburn District wards, in order to bring the constituency within the permitted electorate range, as Hyndburn borough does not contain enough electors to

form a constituency on its own. No part of the proposed Hyndburn constituency would extend into the Borough of Rossendale.

- 3.45** The south of Lancashire was one of the areas in the North West region that received the most representations (over 2,500), overwhelmingly in opposition to the initial proposals. In Preston, there was significant opposition to the initial proposals, and calls for the Fishwick & Frenchwood, and Ribbleton wards to be included within the constituency at the expense of the Greyfriars and Sharoe Green wards, which comprise the Fulwood area (Marcus Atkin – BCE-53154). This view was echoed by Sir Mark Hendrick, MP for Preston (BCE-66332, BCE-98058). Liam Pennington provided further evidence at both the Manchester and Preston public hearings that the wards of Greyfriars and Sharoe Green were of a fundamentally different character to urban Preston (BCE-98003, BCE-98069). Although Fulwood is part of the urban area of Preston, it is not in the existing Preston constituency.
- 3.46** The Assistant Commissioners visited the Greyfriars and Sharoe Green wards, and considered this to be an area that is suburban and of a fundamentally different character to the remainder of Preston. They also visited the Fishwick & Frenchwood, and Ribbleton wards and considered that they are undeniably part of the core of urban Preston and are of a similar character to the city centre. They therefore recommended that the Preston constituency should include the Fishwick & Frenchwood, and Ribbleton wards, and should not include Greyfriars and Sharoe Green wards. This configuration would be more reflective of the existing constituency pattern, as noted above. We agree with their recommendations, and therefore propose this self-contained amendment to the proposed Preston constituency.
- 3.47** The existing constituencies of Hyndburn, Rossendale and Darwen, Blackburn, Chorley, South Ribble, and West Lancashire were all able to remain unchanged, other than to realign constituency boundaries with changes to local government ward boundaries. In our initial proposals, however, we considered that maintaining all six of these constituencies unchanged would result in significant disruption across other parts of Lancashire, and that making some relatively minor changes throughout Lancashire would result in less disruption overall. The initially proposed Blackburn constituency would be changed only by the realignment of the constituency boundary in the south to reflect local government ward changes, aligning the constituency boundary with that of the town's southern boundary, along the M65, and no longer dividing the town of Blackburn. Despite this, the initial proposals concerning the Blackburn South & Lower Darwen ward alone generated over 150 representations, with the residents of the ward being unequivocal that they belong with Darwen, rather than Blackburn (BCE-60667, BCE-61206, and BCE-66774). In support of this position, a number of respondents in this area drew our attention to a recent case where a magistrate ruled Lower Darwen to be different from Blackburn (e.g. BCE-60796).

- 3.48** To the east, the existing constituency boundaries of Burnley and Pendle are both coterminous with their respective local authorities, but both have electorates that are currently below the permitted range. We therefore proposed to include the Briercliffe and Lanehead wards from the Borough of Burnley in the proposed Pendle constituency. To bring the existing Burnley constituency within the permitted electorate range, it was proposed to extend it south by including the five easternmost wards of the Borough of Rossendale: Facit and Shawforth; Greensclogh; Healey and Whitworth; Irwell; and Stacksteads. Since the constituency would cross two local authorities and include the town of Bacup, we also proposed renaming it Burnley and Bacup to reflect both key population centres.
- 3.49** The initial proposals would include the Billington & Langho, East Whalley Read & Simonstone, and Whalley & Painter Wood wards within the Hyndburn constituency. We received a large number of representations from this area, contending that there are no community ties between these areas and Accrington (in the Hyndburn constituency), for example those from Graham Jones (BCE-87817, BCE-98059). They also declared that Whalley is intrinsically linked more to Clitheroe and the wider Ribble Valley than to Accrington or other parts of Hyndburn (BCE-57646, BCE-80637). Respondents also said that the initial proposals would arbitrarily divide the town of Whalley by retaining the Whalley Nethertown ward in the Ribble Valley constituency (Allah Dad – BCE-96183). Finally, some respondents stated that the Sabden area also has links to Whalley, and that all these areas should be considered as one in any revised proposals (BCE-65366).
- 3.50** As a consequence of the changes elsewhere in Lancashire, the existing Rossendale and Darwen constituency would require further electors to bring it within the permitted range, so in our initial proposals we proposed that it should include the Greenfield and Worsley wards (covering the Haslingden area), currently within the Hyndburn constituency. The constituency would continue to include the four wards that contain part of the town of Darwen; namely the Darwen West, Darwen South and Darwen East wards, and the West Pennine ward. It would also contain the Adlington & Anderton, and Chorley North East wards, from the Borough of Chorley. We also proposed the constituency be renamed West Pennine Moors, to reflect the geography. As the proposed Chorley constituency would no longer contain the two wards of Adlington & Anderton, and Chorley North East, we proposed that it should include the Eccleston, Heskin & Charnock Richard ward, and the Croston, Mawdesley & Euxton South ward. The Chorley constituency would still be contained wholly within the Borough of Chorley.

- 3.51** The representations received for the proposed constituencies in south Lancashire were almost wholly in opposition. The West Pennine Moors constituency in particular was almost universally opposed, generating well over 1,500 representations, and with the national Labour Party (BCE-79505) referring to it as ‘anomalous’. This proposed constituency, it was said, would arbitrarily divide both Chorley (Rachel Lewis, BCE-54309), and Rossendale (BCE-87659), and include parts of both boroughs with areas of Darwen, with which many respondents said they have little to nothing in common (BCE-93098, BCE-96879, and Margaret France – BCE-98079). Respondents also said that there were no sufficient links of either transport or community between the Adlington & Anderton ward, the Chorley North East ward, and Blackburn with Darwen, and that these wards looked unequivocally to Chorley (BCE-88317, BCE-96879). Jake Berry, MP for Rossendale and Darwen (BCE-86599, BCE-98063), detailed the perceived disadvantages and implications for community ties that would be created by the proposed constituency. Conversely, there was some limited support for the approach taken here in the initial proposals, predominantly from Conservative Party representatives. For example, Sara Britcliffe, MP for Hyndburn (BCE-96380, BCE-98067) provided evidence in support of the initial proposals. Dale Ferrier (BCE-98081) also supported the proposed Burnley and Bacup constituency at the Preston public hearing.
- 3.52** The Borough of Rossendale would be divided in our initial proposals, with the town and area around Bacup being incorporated within a new constituency centred on Burnley. This was largely opposed (BCE-65096).
- 3.53** The intention of our initial proposals had been to avoid the significant disruption elsewhere that we felt would arise from retaining multiple South Lancashire constituencies essentially unchanged (including changed only to realign with new ward boundaries). It was very clear to our Assistant Commissioners, however, that from the large number of representations we received, and the almost overwhelming opposition contained within them, the constituencies we proposed in this area were widely perceived to prospectively be very disruptive to local ties.

- 3.54 The evidence provided against the initial proposals was considered to be compelling, and our Assistant Commissioners therefore considered that by far the best option in this area would be for the four existing constituencies of Blackburn, Chorley, Hyndburn, and Rossendale with Darwen to remain unchanged, apart from the need to realign constituencies with new ward boundaries. This would also remove any requirement to split the Blackburn South & Lower Darwen ward, as proposed by the national Conservative Party (BCE-86369). We carefully considered the evidence, the Assistant Commissioners' recommendations and the reasons for them and concluded that they were correct in identifying that the initial proposals had not resulted in a satisfactory pattern of constituencies in this area and that maintaining the existing constituencies (only realigned to new local government wards) would be the best solution. As such, we accept their recommendations and propose the existing constituencies of Blackburn, Chorley, Hyndburn, and Rossendale with Darwen remain unchanged, apart from realignments with new ward boundaries.
- 3.55 Elsewhere in south Lancashire, the Assistant Commissioners noted the opposition received to the proposed Burnley and Bacup constituency. The constituency must change from initial proposals due to the revisions to those detailed above. Accordingly, they recommended to us a Burnley constituency that would be largely the same as the existing constituency, but in order to bring the constituency within the permitted electorate range, would also include the two Pendle District wards of Brierfield East & Clover Hill, and Brierfield West & Reedley. This would be considerably less change to the constituency than the initial proposals, and they judged there to be continuous urbanism between these wards and the Burnley wards of Lanehead and Queensgate, as observed during their site visit to the area.
- 3.56 Maintaining the existing configuration of constituencies in the south of Lancashire would also result in less change to the South Ribble constituency than in the initial proposals. The Assistant Commissioners recommended that the South Ribble constituency should continue to contain the two Chorley wards of Croston, Mawdesley & Euxton South, and Ecclestone, Heskin & Charnock Richard, subject to their realignment to reflect local government ward changes. The constituency would also retain all the wards currently within the constituency that are within South Ribble borough, along with the Faringdon East and Faringdon West wards. This configuration would result in a larger proportion of the South Ribble wards and electors being included within the named constituency than the existing pattern. Similarly, it would allow the Walton-le-Dale East and Walton-le-Dale West wards to both be included within the same constituency, an outcome highlighted as desirable by John Walsh (BCE-98088) at the Preston public hearing and Katherine Fletcher, MP for South Ribble, (BCE-82241, BCE-98060). It would also unite Bamber Bridge, with both Bamber Bridge East and West wards included in the same constituency as the Coupe Green & Gregson Lane ward, which also contains some of the

settlement's urban extent. Both Bamber Bridge and Walton-le-Dale would return to the Ribble Valley constituency, where they are currently. Although the South Ribble constituency was broadly well received at initial proposals, and the newly proposed constituency would contain wards from two local authorities, the Assistant Commissioners judged it to be less change than the initial proposals, and therefore recommended it. Having considered the evidence and their reasoning, we agree.

- 3.57** Upon visiting the existing Ribble Valley and Pendle constituencies, the Assistant Commissioners were clearly of the view that the Whalley and Clitheroe areas were similar in nature. They considered that the wards comprising the town of Whalley and the surrounding areas had little in common with Hyndburn, and that there was a greater shared rural character between Whalley and Clitheroe, particularly good transport and communication links. They therefore recommended to us a revised Ribble Valley constituency, and a Pendle and Clitheroe constituency that would contain the entirety of the Borough of Pendle, aside from the two Brierfield wards, and ten wards from the Ribble Valley, covering the Whalley and Clitheroe areas.
- 3.58** This recommendation acknowledged the feedback from representations, insofar as it no longer sought to put any part of the Ribble Valley in a constituency with Hyndburn. Unfortunately, the configuration proposed elsewhere in Lancashire requires some element of the Ribble Valley to be in a constituency with another local authority. As such, the Assistant Commissioners considered that Pendle had more in common, with a shared rural character. It was considered that the inclusion of these areas from the Ribble Valley constituency within the same constituency as wards from Pendle was more suitable than their inclusion in either the Hyndburn or Burnley constituencies. They also considered that, although being a geographical landmark in the area, Pendle Hill provides no impediment to the navigation around this proposed constituency, as they discovered on their site visit.

- 3.59** In accepting the Assistant Commissioners' recommendations for the revised constituencies of Ribble Valley, and Pendle and Clitheroe, we acknowledge that it could be considered that the constituencies might not best reflect local ties, in particular not including Clitheroe in a constituency with the remainder of the Ribble Valley. However, we believe that our proposals here go some way to addressing concerns expressed in representations from both Hyndburn and Whalley that the two areas have little to nothing in common. The new proposal would retain Whalley in the same constituency as Clitheroe, which would also contain a large enough Ribble Valley element that there would be no question of the area being 'overlooked', as was argued would be the case for the three wards appended to Hyndburn at initial proposals (BCE-56260). We also consider that the beneficial consequences of proposing these constituencies – namely the retention of five existing constituencies that are wholly unchanged, or changed only to realign with local government ward boundary changes – is, on balance, a superior and more appropriate pattern of constituencies than were the initial proposals, particularly in view of the very considerable opposition that the latter generated in those parts of Lancashire.
- 3.60** The initial proposals would extend the existing Southport constituency across the county boundary into its rural hinterland within Lancashire. Although it was possible to retain the existing Southport constituency wholly unchanged within the Borough of Sefton, it was considered that this would result in significant disruptive knock-on effects throughout the North West. It was therefore proposed that the four Borough of West Lancashire wards of North Meols, Hesketh-with-Beconsall, Tarleton, and Rufford be included in the Southport constituency.
- 3.61** In consultation, there were some calls for the Rufford ward to be included within the West Lancashire constituency rather than the Southport constituency as proposed (BCE-80156, and Thomas Ward – BCE-53865). At the Preston public hearing, however, there were counters to this argument, with detailed evidence provided by George Rear (BCE-95191, BCE-98066), Jayne Rear (BCE-98071), Lawson Pryke (BCE-98078) and others, arguing that the wards of Hesketh-with-Beconsall, North Meols, Rufford, and Tarleton, comprised the 'Northern Parishes' and should be kept together. Similarly, arguments were put forward by the Conservative Party (BCE-86369) and John Walsh (BCE-98088) to call the constituency Southport and Douglas, in order to reference areas in both local authorities.
- 3.62** It remains our view that there is no suitable solution for the North West region without crossing the county boundary here. Although the existing Southport constituency can remain unchanged, the extent of change and disruption that would result elsewhere by doing so we consider such as to justify the change in this area. Not including the Rufford ward within the West Lancashire constituency would retain it with the other Northern Parishes, and allow the proposed West Lancashire constituency to remain wholly unchanged from its

existing configuration. Whilst acknowledging the calls to change the name of the proposed constituency, the Assistant Commissioners judged that this was not required. We agree with the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioners that there be no change to the West Lancashire and Southport constituencies as initially proposed, in either name or composition.

Merseyside and Cheshire

- 3.63** As a consequence of the changes to the existing Southport constituency, the existing Sefton Central constituency, which could have been left wholly unchanged, was instead subject to minor change in the initial proposals: it would include the Ainsdale ward from the existing Southport constituency, and no longer included the Molyneux ward, which would instead be included in the proposed Liverpool Norris Green constituency. We received approximately 200 representations in opposition to the inclusion of the Ainsdale ward in the Sefton Central constituency, with detailed evidence provided that this ward should be included with Southport (BCE-90826, and Stephen Jowett – BCE-77635). Some of these representations highlighted that both the Southport and Sefton Central constituencies are within the permitted electorate range and therefore do not need to change, but crossing the county boundary was supported by the Conservative Party (BCE-86369), the Labour Party (BCE-79505) and the Liberal Democrats (BCE-97971). It was generally acknowledged that this county crossing would enable a pattern of constituencies across much of the North West that would result in less disruption overall and better reflect the statutory factors than a pattern based on no such crossing.
- 3.64** The wards in the City of Liverpool all have large electorates, with the Liverpool Riverside ward alone containing over 15,000 electors. This meant that fairly significant changes had to be proposed in order to produce constituencies that would be within the permitted electorate range. Although still containing the Walton area, the existing Liverpool Walton constituency would be largely reconfigured under the initial proposals: it would no longer contain the Everton or Anfield wards, and instead include the Croxteth and Norris Green wards. It was also proposed that the constituency would include the Molyneux ward from the Borough of Sefton. As the constituency would be altered significantly, we also proposed a change of name to Liverpool Norris Green. Over 300 representations were received with regard to this constituency, with overwhelming opposition to the proposed name in particular. Many representations highlighted the fact that Walton is an historic town, pre-dating Liverpool (BCE-80111, BCE-80533). Christine Smith (BCE-98026) and Chrissie Byrne (BCE-98018) both provided detailed evidence at the Liverpool public hearing concerning the importance of Walton to the local community, and the history of Liverpool as a whole. This evidence echoed that provided by others during both consultation stages. The other key issue in this constituency concerned the Molyneux ward.

This would be an 'orphan ward' from the Borough of Sefton. It was stated that its proposed inclusion within the Liverpool Norris Green constituency would not only arbitrarily divide the town of Maghull, but add an unrepresentative rural spur to an otherwise urban Liverpool constituency (BCE-80533, BCE-87658, BCE-88751). Some respondents proposed instead that splitting the ward along the prominent boundary of the M57 north of Aintree would resolve this issue (BCE-55250, BCE-80533, and Philip Sapiro PhD, BCE-60777).

- 3.65** The remaining constituencies in Liverpool generated relatively few representations and, although there was some opposition to the initial proposals, there was also support. BCE-80430 and Richard Kemp (BCE-71222) both submitted counter-proposals for alternative configurations of constituencies in Liverpool. The proposed Liverpool Riverside constituency would largely follow the boundaries of the existing constituency, but be more centred to the west: it would include both the Everton and Anfield wards, but not the existing constituency's three south-eastern wards of Greenbank, Mossley Hill, and St. Michael's. Kim Johnson, MP for Liverpool Riverside, proposed an alternative configuration for the constituency (BCE-81963), but her representation did not provide any assessment of or alternatives to resolve the implications to surrounding constituencies across Merseyside. Under our initial proposals the three wards mentioned above would be included in the proposed Liverpool Wavertree constituency. This constituency would remain centred on Wavertree, but in order to bring it within the permitted electorate range, it would no longer include the Church or Old Swan wards. This configuration was supported by Paula Barker, MP for Liverpool Wavertree (BCE-86362). The Church ward would be included in the proposed Liverpool Garston constituency, which would otherwise be similar to the existing Garston and Halewood constituency. This constituency would also then be wholly contained within the City of Liverpool authority, and no longer extend into the Halewood area of the Borough of Knowsley. This approach was supported by Councillor Tom Cardwell (BCE-85119) and Maria Eagle, MP for Garston and Halewood (BCE-74757).
- 3.66** The proposed Liverpool West Derby constituency would include the Old Swan ward, but no longer the Norris Green or Croxteth wards, and extend into the Borough of Knowsley, incorporating the wards of Page Moss and Swanside. There was opposition to this from, for example, Marjorie Morgan (BCE-63959), who stated that Huyton (covered by these latter wards) was fundamentally a part of Knowsley not Liverpool. Sir George Howarth, MP for Knowsley (BCE-86320), commented that he was 'disappointed', but stated 'after looking in detail at the Commission's proposals and examining what alternative proposals might resolve those problems, I was unable to identify a scenario that would meet the relevant criteria'. The City of Liverpool cannot be allocated a whole number of constituencies that would lie entirely within its boundaries, so one constituency

must cross into Knowsley. With the exception of the two wards mentioned previously being included in the Liverpool West Derby constituency, and the realignment of the constituency boundary in the south to match local government ward changes, no further change was proposed for the Knowsley constituency.

3.67 In respect of the Liverpool Norris Green constituency, the Assistant Commissioners recommended that the name be restored to Liverpool Walton, having found the evidence provided by Christine Smith (BCE-98026) and Chrissie Byrne (BCE-98018) particularly helpful in understanding the importance of Walton to the local community, and the history of Liverpool as a whole. We have noted the strength of feeling regarding the proposed constituency's name, and agree with the Assistant Commissioners that the most appropriate name for the constituency would be reverting to Liverpool Walton.

3.68 The Assistant Commissioners considered that proposals to split the ward of Molyneux had some merit, and after visiting the ward as part of their site visits to the North West, they felt that the evidence provided was consistent with their observations. The ward is extensive, containing both urban and rural elements, and small segments of the town of Maghull. The M57 forms a large and recognisable physical boundary between the rural area to the north, and urban Aintree to the south. They therefore recommended that the Molyneux ward be split. Specifically, they recommended that polling districts C4, C5, and C6, covering Aintree, should be included in the Liverpool Walton constituency, with the boundary here following the River Alt as opposed to the motorway. Using the River Alt not only avoids splitting a polling district in this area, but would also respect the boundary between the parishes of Aintree and Melling. The remainder of the ward would be included in the Sefton Central constituency, where the whole ward is currently located. They were persuaded to this approach by the evidence provided in BCE-80111 that although Molyneux was now a ward of the Borough of Sefton, the civil parish of Aintree (which is located in the southern part of the ward) was included in the Liverpool Walton constituency between 1950-1955, providing precedent for the association and further evidence in favour of splitting the ward.

- 3.69 We have considered the recommendations and rationale of the Assistant Commissioners to split the Molyneux ward. We note that this would not only retain more electors in the Sefton Central constituency than do the initial proposals, but also remove the rural spur from an otherwise urban set of wards. We also note that – unlike Aintree – Maghull has never been associated in a constituency with Liverpool. We are mindful that the recommendation would result in ‘orphan’ polling districts from Sefton being included in an otherwise Liverpool constituency, (although the initial proposals would still see the whole ward as an ‘orphan’). Finally, we acknowledge that following the existing ward boundaries in this area under the initial proposals would divide the town of Maghull, and thus likely break community ties there. Although the split of the ward would not result in extensive wider benefits elsewhere in Merseyside, we agree with the Assistant Commissioners that, in this instance, the split of the ward would enable greater adherence to the statutory factors overall, and result in a better configuration for both constituencies involved. We therefore accept their recommendations for the division of the Molyneux ward and the composition and name of the Liverpool Walton constituency.
- 3.70 We did, however, note that the Waddicar area appears to be an unusual inclusion in the Molyneux ward, seeming to be separate from both Sefton and Aintree, and instead form a continuous built up area with the Kirkby area of Knowsley. While it is not possible to include Waddicar in the same constituency as Kirkby in our proposals, it is numerically possible in the split of the Molyneux ward to include the polling district covering Waddicar (C2) in either the Sefton Central or Liverpool Walton constituency. While our revised proposals would retain it in the Sefton Central constituency (as currently), we would particularly welcome views from Waddicar residents as to whether their ties are more south to Aintree and Liverpool rather than west to Maghull and Sefton.
- 3.71 There were very few representations from the proposed Bootle constituency, although among the representations the issue of the town of Crosby being divided between constituencies was raised (BCE-57901). The Assistant Commissioners noted, however, that the Bootle constituency would be entirely unchanged in our initial proposals, and the relative lack of opposition and comment led them to recommend no change to the initial proposals for this constituency.
- 3.72 Although the Assistant Commissioners considered that Richard Kemp’s counter- proposal had merit (BCE-71222), adopting it would not only require further splitting of wards in Merseyside, where proposed constituencies were broadly uncontroversial, but would also alter the otherwise unchanged Bootle constituency. They also noted that BCE-80430 called for the reunification of the Croxteth and West Derby wards within the same constituency, to avoid the division of Croxteth Hall and Country Park (BCE-70948). In view of the limited

amount of objection to the proposed constituencies, however, the Assistant Commissioners did not recommend adoption of this approach, and we agree.

- 3.73** Apart from the changes recommended to the Liverpool Walton constituency, which we have accepted, and in view of the limited opposition elsewhere in the area, the Assistant Commissioners recommended that the remainder of the constituencies in the City of Liverpool should be adopted as in the initial proposals, namely: Liverpool Garston, Liverpool Riverside, Liverpool Wavertree, and Liverpool West Derby. They also recommended that no change be made to the proposed Knowsley constituency. We agree with their recommendations for all these constituencies.
- 3.74** The existing St Helens North constituency could remain unchanged, but we proposed to modify it slightly in order to account for required changes to the St Helens South and Whiston constituency, which is outside the permitted electorate range. As such, the proposed St Helens North constituency would no longer include the Parr ward, but instead include the Town Centre ward. The proposed St Helens South constituency would include all the remaining wards within the Borough of St Helens, and also the Prescott South ward from the Borough of Knowsley. Although this latter would be an ‘orphan ward’, it is currently part of the existing St Helens South and Whiston constituency. Various configurations of constituencies in this and the surrounding area were considered in formulating the initial proposals, but we considered that these would be more disruptive and reflect the statutory factors to a lesser extent.
- 3.75** There was opposition to the initial proposals in St Helens, particularly with regard to the Town Centre ward. Marie Rimmer CBE, MP for St Helens South and Whiston (BCE-75253 and BCE-93357) and the Labour Party (BCE-79505) provided evidence that the Town Centre ward is ‘the historical and civic centre of the original St Helens town, most of which is now found in St Helens South. St Helens North comprises many other towns and urban districts such as Newton-le-Willows, Earlstown, Rainford, Billinge and Haydock that were later added to the St Helens Metropolitan Borough’.
- 3.76** The use of the River Mersey to bisect the Borough of Halton and create two constituencies centred on Widnes and Runcorn respectively was broadly well received (Halton Constituency Labour Party, BCE-80380), and accepted by the qualifying political parties. The northern wards of Halton, including all of the town of Widnes on the northern bank of the river, would form most of a constituency that would extend north across the ceremonial county boundary of Cheshire to include the three wards of Halewood North, Halewood South, and Whiston and Cronton from the Borough of Knowsley. Maria Eagle MP (BCE-74757) considered that this was a sensible solution, and that Halewood had a strong historic association with Widnes. Conversely, we received a number of representations from Halewood arguing the opposite case (BCE-66214, BCE-90734).

- 3.77** As well as providing evidence on the issues with the proposed St Helens North and St Helens South constituencies, Marie Rimmer MP provided a counter-proposal (BCE-75253, BCE-93357). This would return the Town Centre and Parr wards to their existing constituencies and result in the St Helens North constituency being entirely unchanged from its existing configuration. In order to bring the St Helens South constituency within the permitted electorate range, polling district WC5 from the Whiston & Cronton ward would also be included in the constituency. The split of this ward would follow the Liverpool to Manchester railway line, a recognisable physical feature that the counter-proposal states is used 13 times as a ward or polling district boundary in the Knowsley Council area (BCE-93357). This counter-proposal would also result in Whiston Hospital being included in the St Helens South constituency. This constituency would be called St Helens South and Whiston, as it is currently. Our Assistant Commissioners visited the area. They found that the counter-proposal had considerable merit and would result in less disruption than the initial proposals. They therefore recommended to us the modification of the initial proposals for the two named St Helens constituencies as described above. We agree with their recommendation, and accordingly propose St Helens North, and St Helens South and Whiston constituencies as described above.
- 3.78** Our revised proposal for the two South Helens constituencies has an impact on the Widnes and Halewood constituency, insofar as polling district WC5 of the Whiston & Cronton ward would no longer be included in the constituency. Our Assistant Commissioners recommended no further changes to the Widnes and Halewood constituency from initial proposals, and we agree with them that no further amendments are necessary.
- 3.79** On the southern bank of the River Mersey, the town of Runcorn would be the largest urban area of the proposed Runcorn and Helsby constituency. This constituency would contain all the wards of the Borough of Halton that are south of the River Mersey, and extend west into the Cheshire West and Chester unitary authority. We proposed that it contain the four wards of Frodsham, Helsby, Gowy Rural, and Sandstone from that authority, which follow the southern bank of the River Mersey, the Manchester Ship Canal, and the M56 and A56. This configuration was broadly supported (BCE-52697, and Halton Constituency Labour Party – BCE-80380), but as a result of a counter-proposal for constituencies elsewhere in Cheshire, Councillor Bob Rudd, on behalf of Cheshire West and Chester Labour Group (BCE-80689) proposed six split wards (Christleton & Huntington, Gowy Rural, Handbridge Park, Marbury, Sandstone and, Willaston & Thornton) some of which would affect the Runcorn and Helsby constituency. At the Chester public hearing, Councillors Lee Evans (BCE-98037) and Chris Basey (BCE-98039) proposed name changes, providing alternatives such as: Runcorn and Weaver; Runcorn, Frodsham and Helsby; and North West Cheshire. Others, for example BCE-96094, called for a ‘neutral name’ to be used, and referred to the Sandstone Ridge that was located in the constituency. Written

representations also highlighted that the village of Sutton Weaver, in the Marbury ward, would fall outside of this proposed constituency: there were calls for this area to be included in the same constituency as Runcorn, citing both geographic proximity and community links (BCE-88030, BCE-90873, BCE-93016).

- 3.80** The Assistant Commissioners considered the originally proposed composition and name of the constituency to be suitable. They also judged that while the proposals to split the Marbury ward between constituencies had some merit, doing so would not provide sufficient benefits to either of the proposed entities, and therefore could not be recommended. We agree with their recommendations, and as such propose no change to the Runcorn and Helsby constituency as initially proposed.
- 3.81** The proposed Warrington North constituency would be unchanged from the existing constituency, except to realign the constituency boundary with local government ward changes. There were very few representations regarding this constituency, largely due to the lack of change, but the Warrington Conservatives (BCE-81491) wrote in support of the initial proposals for this constituency. The Assistant Commissioners therefore recommended no changes to the Warrington North constituency from initial proposals, and we agree.
- 3.82** The existing Warrington South constituency has an electorate of 86,422, which is considerably above the permitted electorate range. We therefore proposed that the constituency would no longer include the Lymm North & Thelwall, or Lymm South wards. These two wards, which cover the entire town of Lymm, were instead proposed to be included within the Tatton constituency, along with the Dane Valley ward from the Cheshire East unitary authority. We received opposition to the Dane Valley ward being included in this constituency (BCE-78745, BCE-82063), and objections to the Lymm wards no longer being included in a Warrington constituency (BCE-58395, BCE-93734). Conversely, there was also appreciable support for the proposals (BCE-52078, BCE-56967, BCE-68602). In his written representation, the MP for Warrington South, Andy Carter (BCE-82169), provided evidence that Thelwall is an integral part of central Warrington, and has limited connections or community ties with Lymm, despite parts being in the same ward. This representation proposed that the Lymm North & Thelwall ward be split in order to retain more electors in their existing constituency, and avoid the division of the Thelwall community, a view repeated at the Liverpool public hearing (BCE-98020). This approach was also supported by the Conservative Party's counter-proposal (BCE-86369), and a number of members of the public (BCE-53008, BCE-53896, BCE-55227, BCE-66261, BCE-68177, and BCE-90268).

- 3.83** The Assistant Commissioners considered that the Lymm North & Thelwall ward includes two fundamentally disparate parts: Thelwall being an intrinsic part of central Warrington, separated from the rural market-town of Lymm by empty land and the M6 motorway. They considered that the initial proposals here would break community ties in the area, which could be resolved by splitting this ward. They therefore recommended to us that four polling districts – SNC, SND, SNE, SNF – should remain within the Warrington South constituency. These four polling districts align with the boundaries of Grappenhall and Thelwall Parish, which would be divided by the initial proposals. We agree with the Assistant Commissioners’ assessment that the polling districts were part of Warrington and we agree with their recommendation to divide the Lymm North & Thelwell ward. As such, we propose a Warrington South constituency slightly modified from that in the initial proposals, as described above. The remainder of the Lymm North & Thelwall ward, comprising Lymm, would be included in the Tatton constituency, discussed further below.
- 3.84** In the initial proposals, we proposed that a new constituency be constructed, which would be centred around – and named – Northwich. This constituency would be wholly contained within the Cheshire West and Chester unitary authority, and a significantly reconfigured successor to the existing Weaver Vale constituency. The initial proposals in this area garnered support both in written representations (BCE-63662, BCE-63681, BCE-88659, BCE-95088) and at the Chester public hearing (Kate Vaughan – BCE-98033, Gaynor Sinair – BCE-98035, Lynn Gibbon – BCE-98038, and Patricia Parkes – BCE-98040). There was significant support, in particular, for the inclusion of the Davenham, Moulton & Kingsmead ward (BCE-64219, BCE-69475) and the Weaver & Cuddington ward (BCE-57840, BCE-95282) in the constituency, for it sitting entirely within one local authority, and for being centred around Northwich. We also, however, received a large number of representations in opposition to the division of the town of Winsford (BCE-70529, BCE-92149, BCE-95334): of the five named Winsford wards, only four would be included within the proposed Northwich constituency, with the Winsford Over & Verdin ward within the proposed South Cheshire constituency. Due to the nature of the ward, containing not just part of the urban extent of Winsford, but also a large rural component, there were some representations in support of the ward not being with the more urban centred Northwich constituency (BCE-86630). There were also objections from residents of Allostock in the Shakerley ward, who felt that the M6 was a natural boundary between themselves and Northwich, and that they looked northwards to Knutsford instead (Joanna Hartley Green – BCE-69401).

- 3.85** Mike Amesbury, MP for Weaver Vale (BCE-70310), provided a counter-proposal to exchange the Winsford Over and Verdin ward for the Weaver and Cuddington ward. This was also put forward by the Liberal Democrats (BCE-80878). Middlewich Town Council (BCE-66412), and Winsford Town Council (BCE-78020) both provided highly detailed representations setting out the community ties in central Cheshire, and proposing an alternative configuration of constituencies to unite the three key Mid Cheshire towns of Northwich, Middlewich and Winsford within one constituency. They provided evidence that Middlewich has historic and current connections with Northwich and Winsford, and that its presence in Cheshire East is anomalous. This approach was supported by the Labour Party (BCE-79505), and members of the public (BCE-70529, BCE-80106, and David Williams – BCE-82366).
- 3.86** The Assistant Commissioners considered that the division of the Lymm North and Thelwall ward (described above) would enable a new configuration of constituencies in central Cheshire, which would, in effect, be a hybrid between the counter-proposals of the Labour Party (BCE-79505), and the Conservative Party (BCE-86369). They considered that this new configuration would better reflect community ties in this area, and had a number of other benefits. First, the Marbury and Shakerley wards could be ‘returned’ and included in the Tatton constituency, in which they are currently located. This would then be the same as the existing constituency, except for the addition of the town of Lymm, and realignment of the Tatton constituency with changes to local government ward boundaries. This would result in fewer electors moving than in the initial proposals. It would also address the concerns of the residents of Allostock over their links with Knutsford, without requiring another ward split. The Assistant Commissioners were not persuaded by the Conservative Party’s proposal to split the Gawsforth ward to enable the Tatton constituency to remain within two local authorities (BCE-86369): they considered that the split of this ward appeared to be a consequence only of the division of the Lymm North and Thelwall ward, rather than having merit in and of itself.
- 3.87** The Assistant Commissioners also recommended uniting the three Mid Cheshire towns of Middlewich, Northwich and Winsford in a single constituency, to be named Mid Cheshire. This would unite all the named Winsford wards within one constituency, addressing the concerns noted above. Although Middlewich would be an ‘orphan’ ward within the constituency, this would enable the Dane Valley ward to be returned to the Congleton constituency, where it is currently located. There would be no further change to the Congleton constituency from the initial proposals beyond this exchange of the Dane Valley and Middlewich wards. We agree with the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners, and therefore propose the revisions detailed above for the composition of the Northwich constituency, which would also be renamed Mid Cheshire, and for the configuration of the Tatton and Congleton constituencies.

- 3.88** Elsewhere in Cheshire, the proposed Macclesfield constituency would be entirely unchanged under the initial proposals. This garnered a great deal of support, with particular approval for no part of the constituency crossing the county boundary with Greater Manchester (Christopher O’Leary – BCE-64685 and BCE-79132, and David Rutley, MP for Macclesfield – BCE-98048). In accordance with the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners, we propose that there be no change to the Macclesfield constituency.
- 3.89** The proposed Crewe and Nantwich constituency would be changed by just one ward under the initial proposals, except for realignment with local government ward changes: the Wybunbury ward being transferred to the proposed South Cheshire constituency. We received over 60 written representations stating that the Wybunbury ward should be included within the Crewe and Nantwich constituency, with the Leighton ward transferred out instead. These views were echoed by a number of speakers at the Manchester public hearing: Keiran Mullan, MP for Crewe and Nantwich (BCE-85371, and BCE-98045); Philip Jackson (BCE-98006); Gillian Hughes (BCE-98004); Janet Clowes (BCE-98002); Anne Broome (BCE-98001); and John Cornell (BCE-97999). There was, however, also limited support (BCE-78578) for the initial proposals. Peter Kent (BCE-79742) proposed a split of the Haslingden ward, and there were calls to split both the Bunbury (BCE-74006, BCE-74727) and Wrenbury (BCE-53930, and Ricky Mason – BCE-53198) wards, to accommodate new housing developments in Nantwich.
- 3.90** The Assistant Commissioners visited both the Leighton and Wybunbury wards to observe for themselves the issues ‘on the ground’. Although they acknowledged the evidence that had been presented in consultation of links of the latter ward with Crewe (not least in relation to the development of HS2), they were overall not persuaded that the counter-proposal by the Conservative Party and others (BCE-85371) to exchange the Leighton ward with the Wybunbury ward in the Crewe and Nantwich constituency would be a better alternative. They observed that Leighton was clearly an extension of the urban area of Crewe, and that Wybunbury is a large rural ward, separated from Crewe by open land, and which they considered better fitted the character of the South Cheshire constituency rather than Crewe. Similarly, they considered that splitting either the Bunbury or Wrenbury wards to include all new elements of Nantwich within the constituency would not be sufficiently beneficial with regard to the Commission’s policy, and therefore could not be recommended; they considered that this issue would more appropriately be addressed by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in due course. Having considered the evidence and reasoning presented, we accept the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioners and propose no change to the Crewe and Nantwich constituency as initially proposed.

- 3.91** The existing Eddisbury constituency would be significantly reconfigured under the initial proposals. Although it would still span the two unitary authorities of Cheshire East, and Cheshire West and Chester, the constituency would be more compact. The Wybunbury ward would be the only new inclusion within the constituency from Cheshire East, but the changes affecting Cheshire West and Chester wards were more pronounced. As mentioned previously, the town of Winsford would be mostly included in the Northwich constituency, and the South Cheshire constituency no longer extends so far north towards the River Mersey, as that area would be within the proposed Runcorn and Helsby constituency. As the changes to the existing constituency were so significant, we proposed that this constituency be named South Cheshire, in order to better reflect the geographical extent of the constituency.
- 3.92** In drawing up the initial proposals, we went to great lengths to try to avoid dividing the city of Chester, but this proved to be elusive, and the consequential problems caused by not dividing the city of Chester would have been considerable. We therefore proposed that the city be divided, with the River Dee forming a clear geographic boundary between the South Cheshire, and Chester North and Neston constituencies. The five wards that comprise Chester north of the River Dee would be included in the proposed Chester North and Neston constituency, with the Saughall & Mollington, and Willaston & Thornton wards, as well as the three wards that comprise the town of Neston. We considered that to name the constituency Chester North and Neston would be the most accurate and appropriate name for this constituency.

- 3.93** The initial proposal to not include the Lache and Handbridge Park wards in the same constituency as the remainder of Chester was overwhelmingly opposed during the public consultations, with well over 500 representations, almost all in opposition. Although the River Dee is a clear geographic boundary, residents feel it is an arbitrary line, and does not reflect any true divide in the local community (BCE-54665, BCE-62475, BCE-71899, BCE-85335, BCE-96015). Despite the near unanimous opposition, however, it was broadly accepted that there was no better solution that would support a cohesive scheme of constituencies in the wider area. Two former Lord Mayors of Chester (Jill Houlbrook – BCE-98034, and Razia Daniels – BCE-98053) reluctantly acknowledged at the Chester public hearing that they considered there was no acceptable alternative. The Chair of Cheshire West and Chester Labour Group (BCE-80689) proposed splitting six wards just to maintain one constituency. The MP for the City of Chester, Chris Matheson (BCE-71681, BCE-98047), similarly proposed splitting the Handbridge Park ward to retain as many electors as possible within the City of Chester. Richard Beacham (BCE-98049) also called for the split of multiple wards, including the Christleton & Huntington, and Willaston & Thornton wards, in an attempt to keep the City of Chester together. David Rowland (BCE-98042) similarly called for a split of the Gowy Rural ward to retain Mickle Trafford with Chester. Kate Vaughan (BCE-98033) proposed that the proposed South Cheshire constituency be renamed Chester South and Eddisbury.
- 3.94** The Assistant Commissioners acknowledged the considerable body of feeling that the Chester North and Neston constituency was undesirable, that the Handbridge Park and Lache wards look to Chester city centre, and that the River Dee is not a true boundary in the lives and minds of Cestrians. They noted, however, there was near unanimous – albeit reluctant – acceptance that although far from ideal, this was likely the best and most appropriate solution for the wider area. The Assistant Commissioners did not consider that they could recommend to us any of the proposed alternatives that would involve splitting multiple wards, simply to maintain one constituency. Similarly, they considered that a split of Handbridge Park ward would not be based along identifiable community lines. The Assistant Commissioners did recommend, however, that the South Cheshire constituency be renamed Chester South and Eddisbury. In terms of composition, this constituency would be as in the initial proposals, other than containing the Weaver & Cuddington ward rather than the Winsford Over & Verdin ward (as detailed above). They considered that the change of name would reflect the inclusion of the Lache and Handbridge Park wards from Chester, and, having a Chester North constituency it would be sensible to also have a constituency

named Chester South. We have considered their recommendations and the evidence, and conclude that there is no better alternative available that would still enable a sound pattern of constituencies across the wider sub-region. We therefore accept the recommendations of the Assistant Commissioners for both the composition and names of the Chester North and Neston, and Chester South and Eddisbury constituencies.

- 3.95** A key reason for the required changes to the Chester constituency at initial proposals was that there cannot be a whole number of constituencies contained within the boundary of the Metropolitan Borough of Wirral. Although there are currently four whole constituencies, the electorate of the Wirral now only allows for an allocation of three whole constituencies, and one part constituency. As we did not wish to propose a constituency that spanned the River Mersey between the Wirral and the City of Liverpool, it was therefore necessary for a constituency to extend into the Cheshire West and Chester unitary authority.
- 3.96** The Assistant Commissioners considered that the constituencies in the Wirral peninsula should be examined together as one, as there are a number of interlinked issues, each with knock-on implications for neighbouring constituencies. The large ward sizes on the Wirral make finding a whole-ward solution that would meet the statutory factors very difficult.
- 3.97** We proposed that the county-crossing constituency should be centred around Ellesmere Port, which, as it would no longer incorporate Neston, or the Goway Rural ward, would instead extend along the southern bank of the River Mersey, and include the Eastham and Bromborough wards from the existing Wirral South constituency. To take account of these changes, the proposed constituency would simply be called Ellesmere Port. This constituency was supported in its entirety by the Conservative Party (BCE-86369) and the Labour Party (BCE-79505). Justin Madders, MP for Ellesmere Port and Neston (BCE-98050), provided a counter-proposal that would split the Willaston & Thornton ward to retain Little Sutton in the Ellesmere Port constituency.
- 3.98** As the proposed Ellesmere Port constituency would cross the county boundary between Cheshire and Merseyside, the Assistant Commissioners felt that it would be more appropriate to reflect this in the constituency name, and therefore recommended it be renamed Ellesmere Port and Bromborough, while retaining the composition of the constituency as initially proposed. We agree.

3.99 The proposals for the remainder of the Wirral sought to minimise change wherever possible. To achieve this, it was proposed that the Upton ward be split along the physical boundary of the A5027. The northern half of this ward, consisting of the Upton community, would be included within the proposed Wallasey constituency, the remainder of which would be unchanged. The southern half of this ward, containing the Woodchurch community, would continue to be included in the Wirral West constituency, which would also gain the Heswall and Clatterbridge wards. The proposed Birkenhead constituency would be changed only by the inclusion of the Bebington ward. We considered that the benefits provided by the division of the Upton ward considerably outweighed the disadvantages of not doing so; enabling the retention, with minimal change, of three of the existing four constituencies on the Wirral. This approach was supported by all the qualifying political parties, both in writing and at the Manchester public hearing (BCE-97970, BCE-97971, BCE-97972), and in writing by Dame Angela Eagle, MP for Wallasey (BCE-75925). Conversely, there were over 100 representations regarding the proposed split of the Upton ward, almost unanimously in opposition (BCE-82503, BCE-80343, BCE-80658). The Wirral West Labour Party submitted a detailed counter proposal, arguing for a split of the Moreton West and Saughall Massie ward instead of the Upton ward (BCE-79938).

3.100 The Assistant Commissioners noted the broad level of support for the remaining constituencies and approach on the Wirral Peninsula as initially proposed, but they were mindful of the level of opposition from local residents to the division of the Upton ward between constituencies. After considering the alternatives put forward, they considered that the split of a ward on the Wirral was unavoidable if there were not to be significant consequences for constituencies widely across the southern portion of the North West region. They noted the merits in the counter-proposal submitted by Wirral West Labour Party, but considered that the resulting constituencies would be unnecessarily disruptive of the existing configuration of constituencies on the Wirral. They therefore recommend that no revisions be made to the initial proposals for the Birkenhead, Wallasey, and Wirral West constituencies. We agree with them that the initial proposals are likely the best solution, and accept their recommendations for the composition and names of the constituencies in the Wirral.

Greater Manchester

3.101 The metropolitan area of Greater Manchester has a mathematical entitlement to 27 constituencies. Of the existing constituencies, 14 are within the permitted electorate range, seven are below, and six are above. The initial proposals would leave seven of the existing 27 constituencies wholly unchanged.

- 3.102** In the south of the sub-region, the proposed Stockport constituency would only be slightly changed from its existing configuration, with the inclusion of the Stockport borough wards of Reddish North and Reddish South from the existing Denton and Reddish constituency. To allow for this, the Stockport borough Manor ward would be included within the proposed Hazel Grove constituency, which would otherwise be unchanged. The existing Cheadle constituency would be wholly unchanged. This configuration would result in three constituencies contained wholly within the boundaries of the Borough of Stockport. This was widely supported from the Hazel Grove Constituency Association (BCE-79199), members of the public (BCE-89364, BCE-89367) and Members of Parliament; Will Wragg, MP for Hazel Grove (BCE-71359) and Andrew Gwynne, MP for Denton and Reddish (BCE-86363). The Assistant Commissioners noted the degree of support for these three constituencies and that Stockport was an effectively self-contained entity within the sub-region. They did not consider that there were any significant reasons for them to recommend changes to the constituencies as proposed in the initial proposals. We agree and accept their recommendations for constituencies of Stockport, Hazel Grove and Cheadle unchanged from those initially proposed.
- 3.103** Under our initial proposals, the two existing constituencies that were entirely contained within the Borough of Trafford, namely Altrincham and Sale West, and Stretford and Urmston, would be retained wholly unchanged. The existing Wythenshawe and Sale East constituency, which would continue to span the boundaries of the Borough of Trafford and the City of Manchester, would also be wholly unchanged. Although the existing Manchester Withington constituency could remain wholly unchanged, because there have been local government ward changes in this area, to do so would mean having to divide a number of these new wards: the only change made to the constituency under the initial proposals would therefore be to realign it to these new ward boundaries.
- 3.104** The retention of these constituencies essentially unchanged in our initial proposals generated few representations. The majority of those received came from the Stretford and Urmston constituency, and were in support of our proposals not to change the constituency, as typified in the representations from Kate Green, MP for Stretford and Urmston (BCE-97983) and others (Trafford Labour Group -BCE-68792, and Cllr Andrew Western – BCE-97984). In view of the relatively few – and predominantly positive – representations received with regard to the Trafford constituencies, Wythenshawe and Sale East, and Manchester Withington, and lack of any notable or significant counter-proposals for alternative configurations of these constituencies, the Assistant Commissioners recommended to us that there be no revisions to them. We agree with our Assistant Commissioners and confirm that we propose no changes to the initially proposed constituencies of: Wythenshawe and Sale East; Manchester Withington; Altrincham and Sale West; and Stretford and Urmston.

- 3.105** It was possible for us to consider the four geographically contiguous metropolitan boroughs of the City of Salford, Wigan, Bolton and Bury as one group, with an allocation of ten constituencies. This allowed us to retain the distinction between the cities of Salford and Manchester, and to largely maintain the existing distribution and configuration of constituencies within these four boroughs. The proposed Salford constituency would remain wholly within the City of Salford local authority and include the Broughton ward which, although located to the east of the River Irwell, and within the existing Blackley and Broughton constituency, is a ward of the City of Salford local authority. The Eccles, and Swinton & Wardley wards would be included within the proposed Worsley and Eccles constituency, as would be the Astley Mosley Common ward, from the Borough of Wigan. This is the only ward from that authority that would be included within a Salford-based constituency.
- 3.106** Both the Labour Party (BCE-79505) and Conservative Party (BCE-86369) counter-proposals supported a Salford constituency that was identical to our initial proposals for the constituency. The changes in our initial proposals for the remaining constituencies that included part of the City of Salford were considerably less well supported in representations. Barbara Keeley, MP for Worsley and Eccles South spoke at the Manchester public hearing (BCE-98010). In both her statement and written evidence, (BCE-83131) she called for the existing Worsley and Eccles South constituency to remain unchanged, stating that there was no commonality between the Astley Mosley Common ward and Salford borough, and that it was unsuitable to include the Walkden area of Salford in a constituency with Bolton. John Walsh of the Conservative party also spoke at the Manchester public hearing (BCE-98016), in opposition to this view and in support of the initial proposals, highlighting links between Farnworth in Bolton and Little Hulton in Salford.
- 3.107** The Assistant Commissioners considered that one of the key elements of the initial proposals in this area, the aim of maintaining the historic boundary of the River Irwell between the cities of Salford and Manchester, was logical. Very few representations were received from the proposed Salford constituency, and it was supported by the two qualifying parties who specifically commented. The Assistant Commissioners concluded that the initial proposals had taken account of the statutory factors, and they recommended to us the adoption of the initially proposed Salford constituency unchanged. We agree with their recommendation.
- 3.108** Despite the representations from Barbara Keeley MP (BCE-98010), and Walkden residents (BCE-95269, and Teresa Pepper – BCE-79606), the Assistant Commissioners considered that recommending that the existing Worsley and Eccles constituency be unchanged would result in a considerable domino effect across the west of Greater Manchester, with all other resulting constituencies being less in keeping with the statutory factors than the initial proposals. They were therefore not persuaded by the counter-proposals and recommended no change to the Worsley and Eccles constituency as initially proposed.

- 3.109** Within the Metropolitan Borough of Wigan, the existing Wigan constituency would remain wholly unchanged under the initial proposals. We received very few representations regarding this constituency, and the Assistant Commissioners concluded that the initial proposals had taken account of the statutory factors. They therefore recommended no revisions to it. We agree with their recommendations and so propose no changes to either the Worsley and Eccles or Wigan constituencies as initially proposed.
- 3.110** The existing Makerfield constituency could remain unchanged, but, in our initial proposals, we modified it in order to account for required changes to the existing Leigh constituency, which has an electorate over the permitted range. The proposed Makerfield constituency would therefore be largely unchanged in our initial proposals, except to include the Leigh West ward rather than the Ashton ward. In turn, the proposed Leigh South and Atherton constituency would include the Atherton ward. The Leigh South and Atherton constituency would also include the Ashton ward, which is currently in the Makerfield constituency. We recognised that the proposed inclusion of the West Leigh ward in a Makerfield constituency, and the Ashton ward in a Leigh South and Atherton constituency, would mean that the towns of both Leigh and Ashton-in-Makerfield would be divided between constituencies, but considered that configurations of wards in this and the surrounding area meant that some division of communities was unavoidable.
- 3.111** In announcing our initial proposals, we welcomed representations with alternative arrangements in this area that would result in less disruption locally, without resulting in consequential negative effects elsewhere in Greater Manchester. The substantial number of representations received with regard to these constituencies contained a significant amount of opposition – approximately 500 individual representations, and an equivalent amount in petition responses – and was the largest single issue in Greater Manchester. There was overwhelming opposition to the proposed inclusion of the Leigh West ward (which contains Leigh Town Hall and a significant proportion of Leigh town centre) in the Makerfield constituency, and the Ashton ward (which contains half of the town of Ashton-in-Makerfield) in the Leigh South and Atherton constituency. The issue was summed up concisely in BCE-55212: ‘Will it be renamed as such, i.e. Ashton-out of-Makerfield, Ashton-used to be in-Makerfield or even Ashton-now in-Leigh South and Atherton’. Both the current MPs in the area, James Grundy, MP for Leigh (BCE-86586), and Yvonne Fovargue, MP for Makerfield (BCE-74981), provided detailed representations on the issue. James Grundy MP also spoke at the Manchester public hearing (BCE-97973, BCE-98000): while highlighting a positive element of the initial proposals for the constituencies, in that they would unite the town of Atherton, which had previously been divided between the Leigh and Bolton South constituencies, he nonetheless opposed their configuration and spoke to the counter-proposals for alternative configurations that he had submitted (BCE-86586).

- 3.112** The Assistant Commissioners considered that the counter-proposals put forward by the Labour Party (BCE-79505) would require further changes across the west of Greater Manchester that were unnecessary, including the division of the town of Walkden. Similarly, the proposal by Andrew Teale (BCE-71648) to exchange the Golborne and Lowton West, and Lowton East wards for the Hindley and Hindley green wards, while self contained, would not in the view of the Assistant Commissioners constitute a resolution to the issue of divided communities, as evidenced by the receipt of a number of petition representations against this counter proposal (BCE-97957). They did not consider that the counter-proposal from Yvonne Fovargue MP met our policy for splitting a ward, as they considered that it appeared to be balancing the numbers, rather than based on evidence of community ties.
- 3.113** Having considered the evidence, the Assistant Commissioners recommended the inclusion of the Ashton ward in the Makerfield constituency, and the Leigh West ward in the Leigh and Atherton constituency. In order to bring the latter within the permitted electorate range, they recommended the split of both the Atherleigh and Leigh West wards (using polling districts LCA and LDA respectively), as outlined by the Conservative Party's counter-proposal (BCE-86369), and the 'Keep Leigh in Leigh' Campaign, represented by James Grundy MP (BCE-86586). The areas of Dangerous Corner and Pickley Green would be included in the proposed Makerfield constituency, which would be unchanged from the existing constituency, apart from the addition of these communities. The Leigh and Atherton constituency would include the remainder of both split wards.
- 3.114** The Assistant Commissioners were mindful that the incoming ward boundary between the new Hindley Green, and Atherton South & Lilford wards is very similar to the existing polling district boundary, but more closely aligns with Westleigh Brook. Splitting the LCA polling district here would mean that although splitting the two 'existing' wards of Atherleigh and Leigh West in this way, it would actually only be splitting a single incoming ward, Leigh West. In order to minimise disruption and to see the area for themselves, our Assistant Commissioners undertook a site visit to the area. From their observations they concluded that Westleigh Brook is a recognisable feature, and would be a suitable feature along which to split the polling district. Similarly, they felt that the Dangerous Corner area was no more linked to Leigh than it was to Hindley, and that Pickley Green was similarly suitable to be included within the Makerfield constituency. They therefore recommended the further division of the LCA polling district itself. We acknowledge the issues caused by the initial proposals here and that they are deeply unpopular as a number of local ties would be broken. We agree with the recommendations of our Assistant Commissioners for revised Makerfield, and Leigh and Atherton constituencies, as detailed above. We accept

their rationale for the splitting of the two wards, noting that this will, in practice, only split one incoming ward, and maintain the existing centres of Ashton and Leigh within their respective constituencies, without producing a negative domino effect across the west of Greater Manchester.

- 3.115** In our initial proposals the proposed Bolton West constituency would be largely unchanged, apart from the inclusion of the Hulton ward to bring it within the permitted electorate range, as the Atherton ward would no longer be included: this would result in the constituency being wholly contained within the Borough of Bolton. The proposed Bolton North East constituency would only differ from the existing constituency by one ward; the Little Lever and Darcy Lever ward would be included within the constituency from Bolton South, which would include the Salford wards of Walkden North, Walkden South, and Little Hulton. This would also prevent the town of Walkden being split between constituencies. In order to acknowledge the crossing between the Borough of Bolton and the City of Salford, we proposed to name the constituency Bolton South and Walkden. Chris Green, MP for Bolton West (BCE-97998), spoke in support of the initial proposals for Bolton, but there was also opposition to this proposal, with a number of representations from the Walkden area providing evidence that it is an integral part of Salford borough and should not be included within a constituency alongside wards from Bolton (BCE-87274, Barbara Keeley MP – BCE-83131 and BCE-98010).
- 3.116** We proposed that the Radcliffe North ward be included in the Bury North constituency, for which there was some support, including from James Daly, MP for Bury North (BCE-86367, BCE-98013), who provided written and oral evidence that the connections of Ainsworth and Bradley Fold to Bury town centre are good reasons to include the ward. There were, however, also calls for the Unsworth ward to be included in the Bury North constituency instead (Andrew Teale – BCE-71648), although Councillors Paul Cropper (BCE-98007) and Jo Lancaster (BCE-98008) spoke against this option at the Manchester public hearing. Similarly, Councillor Nathan Baroda (BCE-98011) highlighted the strong links between the Unsworth ward and Whitefield, and praised the initial proposals for keeping the two areas together. We proposed that the Kersal and Broughton Park ward, from the City of Salford, should be included in the proposed Bury South constituency: Councillor Arnie Saunders (BCE-85244, BCE-97989) provided both written and oral evidence that this was an acceptable solution, although called for the name of the constituency to be changed to Bury South and Kersal to reflect the inclusion of this ward.

- 3.117** The Bolton West, Bolton North East, and Bolton South and Walkden constituencies were all broadly supported, with few representations received, apart from those from the Walkden area. As such the Assistant Commissioners recommended no change to these three constituencies as initially proposed. They also agreed with the evidence provided at the Manchester public hearing, and considered that the Radcliffe North ward is better suited than the Unsworth ward to be included in the Bury North constituency. They judged that the existing name of Bury South remained appropriate, and there was no need to change it. We agree with their recommendations that all five named Bolton and Bury constituencies be unchanged from the initial proposals.
- 3.118** In our initial proposals, in order to decrease the electorate of the existing Rochdale constituency, which was too high, we proposed that the Spotland and Falinge ward be included in the Heywood constituency, although, as the existing Heywood and Middleton constituency already had an electorate above the permitted range, we further proposed that the wards of South Middleton and East Middleton no longer be included in that constituency. As the whole of Middleton would no longer be included in the constituency, it was proposed that the constituency be named simply Heywood. Tony Lloyd, MP for Rochdale, wrote in favour of the Labour Party counter proposal (which supported our Rochdale proposal), also proposed a name change (BCE-82224, BCE-97997). There were also calls to follow the incoming ward boundaries in Rochdale rather than the existing ones (BCE-97992).
- 3.119** The proposed Manchester Blackley constituency would be significantly reconfigured from the existing Blackley and Broughton constituency on which it is based. It would no longer contain any wards from the City of Salford, nor the Cheetham ward from the City of Manchester. Instead it would include the Moston ward, and the South Middleton and East Middleton wards from the Metropolitan Borough of Rochdale. Almost 100 representations were received from the town of Middleton, with many of these contending that Middleton is an historic town with a clear and long-established identity, and calling for it to remain united within one constituency (BCE-86364, BCE-89493).
- 3.120** The Assistant Commissioners noted the considerable body of objections – and the quality of the evidence – from Middleton residents opposed to the division of their town, and the calls to have their town’s name included in that of the constituency (BCE-86364). They acknowledged that the division of the town would not be an ideal outcome, but considered that the alternatives would cause extensive disruption to neighbouring constituencies and therefore fail to provide a better overall pattern of constituencies for this wider area. They considered carefully whether the name of Middleton should be referenced in the name of either proposed constituency, but were ultimately not persuaded that it should be. They considered that the use of incoming ward boundaries within the borough of Rochdale would not have any impact on resolving issues such as the

division of Middleton between constituencies, and the Assistant Commissioners could not support the alternative method of resolving the issue i.e. the splitting of multiple wards in the area. They therefore recommended no revisions to the initially proposed constituencies of Heywood, Rochdale, and Manchester Blackley. We agree with their recommendations.

- 3.121** Within the Borough of Oldham, we proposed that both the Oldham East and Saddleworth, and Oldham West and Royton constituencies should remain wholly unchanged. At the same time, we proactively identified an alternative that we considered had merit: the Alexandra and St Mary's wards, both currently within the existing Oldham East and Saddleworth constituency, could be exchanged with the Royton North and Royton South wards, both currently within the existing Oldham West and Royton constituency. This would provide a more compact urban constituency to the west, containing a greater proportion of Oldham town centre, and a constituency to the east that would have a more suburban and moorland character. While the initial proposal was to retain the existing two constituencies unchanged, representations on this possible alternative were actively sought.
- 3.122** The responses were fairly equally spread, with support for the alternative (for example Jamie Curley – BCE-83531) slightly outweighing numerically that for maintaining the existing constituencies. Both Debbie Abrahams, MP for Oldham East and Saddleworth (BCE-86350, and BCE-95669) and Jim McMahon, MP for Oldham West and Royton (BCE-98127) were in favour of maintaining the existing configuration, however. This view was shared by a former leader of Oldham Council (BCE-92982) and others (BCE-80264), who all provided detailed evidence in support of maintaining the existing configuration. Finally, the Chadderton Historical Society called for the inclusion of Chadderton within the name of the western constituency (BCE-86389).
- 3.123** Despite the numerical support for the alternative configuration of two Oldham constituencies laid out in the initial proposals report, the Assistant Commissioners were persuaded by the quality of the evidence presented that maintaining both of the Oldham constituencies entirely unchanged would be the solution most in keeping with the statutory factors. As such, they recommended Oldham East and Saddleworth, and Oldham West and Royton unchanged from their existing configuration, as in the initial proposals. As neither constituency would be changing, they were not persuaded of the case for a name change. Having considered the evidence and reasoning presented by the Assistant Commissioners, we agree with these recommendations.

- 3.124** The existing Stalybridge and Hyde constituency could remain unchanged, but in our initial proposals we considered that maintaining it resulted in a less than ideal configuration across the east of Greater Manchester. We therefore proposed that it no longer include the Mossley, Stalybridge North and Dukinfield Stalybridge wards, but would include the Denton North East, Denton West and Denton South wards, which constitute the entirety of the town of Denton. The constituency would remain wholly within the Borough of Tameside and unite the communities of Denton and Hyde, whose urban areas almost adjoin, and consequently be renamed Denton and Hyde.
- 3.125** The electorate of the existing Ashton-under-Lyne constituency is below the permitted range. We therefore proposed that it include the wards of Dukinfield, Dukinfield Stalybridge, Mossley, and Stalybridge North. As the inclusion of these would take the Ashton-under-Lyne electorate above the permitted range, so it was proposed to no longer include the Failsworth East and Failsworth West wards, or the Droylsden East and Droylsden West wards. Along with the Audenshaw ward, these would form a Failsworth and Droylsden constituency. This constituency would also include the Clayton & Openshaw, and Gorton & Abbey Hey wards from the City of Manchester. Furthermore, it was proposed that the Miles Platting & Newton Heath ward be split between this constituency and the proposed Manchester Central constituency: the latter to include the Miles Platting area, to the west of the A6010, and the Failsworth and Droylsden constituency to contain the Newton Heath area to the east of this road. The proposed Manchester Central constituency would also include the Cheetham ward, and not the Clayton & Openshaw or Moston wards.
- 3.126** Realignment of the Manchester Gorton constituency with new local government ward boundaries would no longer include the Gorton and Abbey Hey ward in the constituency, so we proposed that the new constituency be called Manchester Longsight. Afzal Khan, MP for Manchester Gorton (BCE-80612, and BCE-98014), spoke at the Manchester public hearing and agreed that the composition of the proposed constituency was reasonable, but a better name should be applied.
- 3.127** There were two key issues raised by representations regarding the constituencies wholly within the borough of Tameside. The first was that the existing Stalybridge and Hyde constituency had been changed, when it did not need to be. Secondly, in the newly proposed constituency, Denton and Hyde are separated by the River Tame, so they should not be included together. Concerns were also raised that the proposed Failsworth and Droylsden constituency would cross three local authorities, and contain a split ward. We received both a weight and quality of evidence (e.g. David Heyes, BCE-98012) that Failsworth and Droylsden do not share a community of interest, and are in fact geographically separated by the River Medlock. Jonathan Reynolds, MP for Stalybridge and

Hyde (BCE-86365), Andrew Gwynne, MP for Denton and Reddish (BCE-86363, and BCE-97976), and Angela Rayner, MP for Ashton-under-Lyne (BCE-75197) all provided detailed evidence in opposition to the initial proposals, highlighting the points detailed above.

- 3.128** Site visits undertaken to this area by the Assistant Commissioners confirmed to them the evidence provided. As such, the Assistant Commissioners considered that a significant change from the initial proposals in the east of Greater Manchester would be appropriate. They recommended maintaining the existing Stalybridge and Hyde constituency entirely unchanged, and an Ashton-under-Lyne constituency containing all the remaining Tameside wards, barring the three named Denton wards. These three Denton wards would be included with four wards from the City of Manchester: Burnage, Gorton & Abbey Hey, Levenshulme, and Longsight. The Assistant Commissioners considered that there was very persuasive evidence provided in representations (for example BCE-97976, and BCE-98012) that the Denton area itself was originally overspill from east Manchester, and that the areas are well linked both physically and in community terms. On their site visits to the area, the Assistant Commissioners observed the excellent transport links across this area. They recommended that this constituency be named Gorton and Denton. They also recommended that the wards of Ardwick, Fallowfield, Hulme, Moss Side, Rusholme, and Whalley Range be included in a new, compact Manchester Rusholme constituency as part of this reconfiguration of constituencies in the east of Greater Manchester. These wards are all to the south of the Mancunian Way, and are all of a similar character, containing a large proportion of the student population of Manchester.
- 3.129** Finally, the Assistant Commissioners recommended a Manchester Central constituency to include the Ancoats & Beswick, Cheetham, Clayton and Openshaw, Deansgate, Miles Platting & Newton Heath, Piccadilly, and the two Failsworth wards. This would be broadly similar to the existing composition of the constituency, with the addition of Failsworth. Again, the Assistant Commissioners were persuaded by evidence that Failsworth is closely linked to east Manchester, and site visits to the area confirmed this. The constituencies recommended in this area of Tameside and Manchester area follow a broadly similar pattern to that proposed by John Bryant (BCE-70325).
- 3.130** The Assistant Commissioners noted that their recommendations for these constituencies would remove from the east of Greater Manchester any constituency crossing three local authorities, and eliminate any requirement for a split ward, while reflecting and addressing the key issues in the objections received to initial proposals across this area. We agree with their recommendations in full, for the following five constituencies: Ashton-under-Lyne; Gorton and Denton; Manchester Central; Manchester Rusholme; and Stalybridge and Hyde.

4 How to have your say

- 4.1 We are consulting on our revised proposals for a four-week period, from 8 November to 5 December 2022 inclusive. We encourage everyone to use this last opportunity to help finalise the design of the new constituencies – the more public views we hear and the more local information that is provided, the more informed our decisions will be before making final recommendations to Parliament.
- 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 which 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 which 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 making comments on our revised proposals, we ask people to bear in mind the tight constraints placed on the Commission by the rules set by Parliament, discussed in chapter 2 and in our Guide to the 2023 Review. Most importantly:
- We cannot recommend constituencies that have electorates that contain more than 77,062 or fewer than 69,724 electors
 - We are basing our proposals on local government ward boundaries (existing or – where relevant – prospective) as at 1 December 2020 as the building blocks of constituencies – although where there is strong justification for doing so, we will consider dividing a ward between constituencies (see the Guide to the 2023 Review for more detailed information)
 - We have constructed constituencies within regions, so as not to cross regional boundaries – very 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 comment about their local area to bear in mind there may be consequential effects for neighbouring areas that might result from their suggestions. The Commission must look at the recommendations for new constituencies across the whole region (and, indeed, across England). What may be a better solution for one location may have undesirable consequences for others. We therefore ask everyone wishing to respond to our consultation to be aware that their counter-proposals may have an impact on neighbouring constituencies, and on those further afield across the region.

How can you give us your views?

- 4.5 Views on our revised proposals should be given to the Commission in writing. We encourage everyone who wishes to comment on our proposals in writing to do so through our interactive consultation website at www.bcereviews.org.uk – you will find all the details you need and can comment directly through the website. The website allows you to explore the map of our proposals and obtain further data, including the electorate sizes of every ward. You can also upload text or data files you may have previously prepared setting out your views.
- 4.6 We encourage everyone, before submitting a representation, to read our approach to protecting and using your personal details (available at www.bcereviews.org.uk). As these consultations are very much concerned with a respondent's sense of place and community, when publishing responses, we will associate the response with the general locality (e.g. town or village) of the respondent's address, but we will not publish a respondent's name or detailed address with their response, unless they specifically ask us to do so.
- 4.7 It is important to stress that all representations, whether they have been made through our website or sent to us in writing, will be given equal consideration by the Commission.

What do we want views on?

- 4.8 We would particularly like to ask two things of people responding to our consultation. Firstly, if you support our revised proposals, please tell us so. Past experience suggests that too often people who are happy with our proposals do not respond in support, while those who object to them do respond to make their points. That can give a distorted view of the balance of public support or objection to our proposals. Secondly, if you are considering objecting to our revised proposals, please use the resources (such as maps and electorate figures) available on our website and at the places of deposit to put forward counter-proposals that are in accordance with the rules to which we are working.
- 4.9 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 that we present in 2023.

Appendix: Revised proposals for constituencies, including wards and electorates

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Altrincham and Sale West BC			73,934
	Altrincham	Trafford	8,954
	Ashton upon Mersey	Trafford	7,611
	Bowdon	Trafford	7,299
	Broadheath	Trafford	10,024
	Hale Barns	Trafford	7,507
	Hale Central	Trafford	7,526
	St. Mary's	Trafford	8,656
	Timperley	Trafford	8,458
	Village	Trafford	7,899
Ashton-under-Lyne BC			72,278
	Ashton Hurst	Tameside	8,808
	Ashton St. Michael's	Tameside	8,809
	Ashton Waterloo	Tameside	8,541
	Audenshaw	Tameside	9,802
	Droylsden East	Tameside	8,896
	Droylsden West	Tameside	9,018
	Dukinfield	Tameside	9,500
	St. Peter's	Tameside	8,904
Barrow and Furness CC			76,603
	Barrow Island	Barrow-in-Furness	1,633
	Central	Barrow-in-Furness	2,762
	Dalton North	Barrow-in-Furness	4,940
	Dalton South	Barrow-in-Furness	4,738
	Hawcoat	Barrow-in-Furness	4,144
	Hindpool	Barrow-in-Furness	4,284
	Newbarns	Barrow-in-Furness	4,639
	Ormsgill	Barrow-in-Furness	4,366
	Parkside	Barrow-in-Furness	4,233
	Risedale	Barrow-in-Furness	4,623
	Roosecote	Barrow-in-Furness	3,964
	Walney North	Barrow-in-Furness	4,351
	Walney South	Barrow-in-Furness	4,138

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Black Combe & Scafell	Copeland	3,395
	Millom	Copeland	4,487
	Broughton & Coniston – part of (polling districts AHA, AHB, AHC, BZ, CA, CB, CL, and CY)	South Lakeland	2,032
	Furness Peninsula	South Lakeland	4,658
	Ulverston East	South Lakeland	4,573
	Ulverston West	South Lakeland	4,643
Birkenhead BC			76,271
	Bebington	Wirral	11,993
	Bidston and St. James	Wirral	10,273
	Birkenhead and Tranmere	Wirral	10,164
	Claughton	Wirral	11,575
	Oxton	Wirral	11,140
	Prenton	Wirral	11,123
	Rock Ferry	Wirral	10,003
Blackburn BC			70,586
	Audley & Queen's Park	Blackburn with Darwen	6,019
	Bastwell & Daisyfield	Blackburn with Darwen	5,744
	Billinge & Beardwood	Blackburn with Darwen	5,971
	Blackburn Central	Blackburn with Darwen	5,589
	Blackburn South East	Blackburn with Darwen	5,621
	Ewood	Blackburn with Darwen	6,048
	Little Harwood & Whitebirk	Blackburn with Darwen	5,686
	Livesey with Pleasington	Blackburn with Darwen	6,284
	Mill Hill & Moorgate	Blackburn with Darwen	5,472
	Roe Lee	Blackburn with Darwen	6,267
	Shear Brow & Corporation Park	Blackburn with Darwen	6,099
	Wensley Fold	Blackburn with Darwen	5,786

Constituency Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Blackpool North and Fleetwood BC		75,396
Anchorsholme	Blackpool	5,036
Bispham	Blackpool	4,877
Greenlands	Blackpool	4,927
Ingthorpe	Blackpool	5,060
Norbreck	Blackpool	4,954
Bourne	Wyre	4,900
Carleton	Wyre	3,756
Cleveleys Park	Wyre	3,871
Jubilee	Wyre	3,990
Marsh Mill	Wyre	5,132
Mount	Wyre	4,100
Park	Wyre	3,619
Pharos	Wyre	3,706
Pheasant's Wood	Wyre	1,788
Rossall	Wyre	4,558
Stanah	Wyre	3,934
Victoria & Norcross	Wyre	3,668
Warren	Wyre	3,520
Blackpool South BC		76,071
Bloomfield	Blackpool	4,324
Brunswick	Blackpool	4,332
Claremont	Blackpool	4,538
Clifton	Blackpool	4,754
Hawes Side	Blackpool	4,941
Highfield	Blackpool	4,864
Layton	Blackpool	4,793
Marion	Blackpool	5,133
Park	Blackpool	4,967
Squires Gate	Blackpool	4,793
Stanley	Blackpool	5,433
Talbot	Blackpool	4,455
Tyldesley	Blackpool	4,698
Victoria	Blackpool	4,536
Warbreck	Blackpool	4,886
Waterloo	Blackpool	4,624
Bolton North East BC		77,020
Astley Bridge	Bolton	10,331
Bradshaw	Bolton	9,007

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Brightmet	Bolton	9,497
	Bromley Cross	Bolton	10,505
	Crompton	Bolton	10,842
	Halliwell	Bolton	8,382
	Little Lever and Darcy Lever	Bolton	9,667
	Tonge with the Haulgh	Bolton	8,789
Bolton South and Walkden BC			75,716
	Farnworth	Bolton	10,411
	Great Lever	Bolton	9,455
	Harper Green	Bolton	9,703
	Kearsley	Bolton	10,419
	Rumworth	Bolton	9,420
	Little Hulton	Salford	8,587
	Walkden North	Salford	8,928
	Walkden South	Salford	8,793
Bolton West CC			72,125
	Heaton and Lostock	Bolton	10,721
	Horwich and Blackrod	Bolton	10,681
	Horwich North East	Bolton	9,894
	Hulton	Bolton	9,938
	Smithills	Bolton	10,278
	Westhoughton North and Chew Moor	Bolton	10,855
	Westhoughton South	Bolton	9,758
Bootle BC			75,194
	Church	Sefton	9,483
	Derby	Sefton	8,992
	Ford	Sefton	9,517
	Linacre	Sefton	8,828
	Litherland	Sefton	9,043
	Netherton and Orrell	Sefton	9,813
	St. Oswald	Sefton	8,523
	Victoria	Sefton	10,995
Burnley CC			75,436
	Bank Hall	Burnley	3,853
	Briercliffe	Burnley	4,437
	Brunshaw	Burnley	4,757
	Cliviger with Worsthorne	Burnley	4,342
	Coal Clough with Deerplay	Burnley	3,926

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Daneshouse with Stoneyholme	Burnley	4,200
	Gannow	Burnley	4,130
	Gawthorpe	Burnley	4,500
	Hapton with Park	Burnley	4,624
	Lanehead	Burnley	4,511
	Queensgate	Burnley	3,881
	Rosegrove with Lowerhouse	Burnley	4,788
	Rosehill with Burnley Wood	Burnley	4,430
	Trinity	Burnley	3,893
	Whittlefield with Ightenhill	Burnley	4,710
	Brierfield East & Clover Hill	Pendle	6,093
	Brierfield West & Reedley	Pendle	4,361
Bury North BC			77,009
	Church	Bury	8,465
	East	Bury	8,197
	Elton	Bury	8,675
	Moorside	Bury	8,753
	North Manor	Bury	8,194
	Radcliffe North	Bury	8,628
	Ramsbottom	Bury	9,149
	Redvales	Bury	8,832
	Tottington	Bury	8,116
Bury South BC			74,598
	Besses	Bury	8,088
	Holyrood	Bury	8,581
	Pilkington Park	Bury	7,599
	Radcliffe East	Bury	9,047
	Radcliffe West	Bury	8,422
	Sedgley	Bury	8,824
	St. Mary's	Bury	8,079
	Unsworth	Bury	7,271
	Kersal & Broughton Park	Salford	8,687
Carlisle CC			75,868
	Belah & Kingmoor	Carlisle	5,729
	Botcherby & Harraby North	Carlisle	6,077
	Brampton & Fellside	Carlisle	6,433
	Cathedral & Castle	Carlisle	6,428
	Currock & Upperby	Carlisle	6,469

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Denton Holme & Morton South	Carlisle	6,327
	Harraby South & Parklands	Carlisle	6,310
	Longtown & the Border	Carlisle	5,903
	Newtown & Morton North	Carlisle	6,676
	Sandsfield & Morton West	Carlisle	6,928
	Stanwix & Houghton	Carlisle	6,849
	Wetheral & Corby	Carlisle	5,739
Cheadle BC			73,775
	Bramhall North	Stockport	10,400
	Bramhall South and Woodford	Stockport	10,095
	Cheadle and Gatley	Stockport	12,084
	Cheadle Hulme North	Stockport	10,108
	Cheadle Hulme South	Stockport	10,815
	Heald Green	Stockport	9,919
	Stepping Hill	Stockport	10,354
Chester North and Neston CC			72,327
	Blacon	Cheshire West and Chester	9,998
	Chester City & the Garden Quarter	Cheshire West and Chester	13,371
	Great Boughton	Cheshire West and Chester	8,720
	Little Neston	Cheshire West and Chester	4,251
	Neston	Cheshire West and Chester	4,279
	Newton & Hoole	Cheshire West and Chester	11,478
	Parkgate	Cheshire West and Chester	4,124
	Saughall & Mollington	Cheshire West and Chester	4,281
	Upton	Cheshire West and Chester	7,592
	Willaston & Thornton	Cheshire West and Chester	4,233
Chester South and Eddisbury CC			71,975
	Audlem	Cheshire East	4,165
	Bunbury	Cheshire East	4,157
	Wrenbury	Cheshire East	4,525
	Wybunbury	Cheshire East	4,488

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Christleton & Huntington	Cheshire West and Chester	8,520
	Farndon	Cheshire West and Chester	3,755
	Handbridge Park	Cheshire West and Chester	7,402
	Lache	Cheshire West and Chester	3,911
	Malpas	Cheshire West and Chester	3,755
	Tarporley	Cheshire West and Chester	4,122
	Tarvin & Kelsall	Cheshire West and Chester	7,415
	Tattenhall	Cheshire West and Chester	3,890
	Weaver & Cuddington	Cheshire West and Chester	11,870
Chorley CC			74,568
	Adlington & Anderton	Chorley	6,229
	Buckshaw & Whittle	Chorley	6,785
	Chorley East	Chorley	6,074
	Chorley North & Astley	Chorley	6,038
	Chorley North East	Chorley	5,590
	Chorley North West	Chorley	5,872
	Chorley South East & Heath Charnock	Chorley	6,902
	Chorley South West	Chorley	5,701
	Clayton East, Brindle & Hoghton	Chorley	6,678
	Clayton West & Cuerden	Chorley	6,566
	Coppull	Chorley	6,194
	Euxton	Chorley	5,939
Congleton CC			69,836
	Alsager	Cheshire East	10,146
	Brereton Rural	Cheshire East	5,215
	Congleton East	Cheshire East	10,880
	Congleton West	Cheshire East	11,157
	Dane Valley	Cheshire East	8,296
	Odd Rode	Cheshire East	7,034
	Sandbach Elworth	Cheshire East	4,587
	Sandbach Ettiley Heath and Wheelock	Cheshire East	4,479

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Sandbach Heath and East	Cheshire East	3,744
	Sandbach Town	Cheshire East	4,298
Crewe and Nantwich CC			76,236
	Crewe Central	Cheshire East	3,421
	Crewe East	Cheshire East	10,658
	Crewe North	Cheshire East	3,411
	Crewe South	Cheshire East	6,682
	Crewe St. Barnabas	Cheshire East	3,079
	Crewe West	Cheshire East	7,024
	Haslington	Cheshire East	7,182
	Leighton	Cheshire East	4,429
	Nantwich North and West	Cheshire East	7,146
	Nantwich South and Stapeley	Cheshire East	7,360
	Shavington	Cheshire East	4,053
	Willaston and Rope	Cheshire East	4,122
	Wistaston	Cheshire East	7,669
Ellesmere Port and Bromborough BC			71,027
	Central & Grange	Cheshire West and Chester	8,129
	Ledsham & Manor	Cheshire West and Chester	7,758
	Netherpool	Cheshire West and Chester	4,214
	Strawberry	Cheshire West and Chester	4,284
	Sutton Villages	Cheshire West and Chester	8,257
	Westminster	Cheshire West and Chester	3,457
	Whitby Groves	Cheshire West and Chester	3,778
	Whitby Park	Cheshire West and Chester	4,139
	Wolverham	Cheshire West and Chester	3,782
	Bromborough	Wirral	12,094
	Eastham	Wirral	11,135
Fylde CC			75,114
	Ansdell	Fylde	3,479
	Ashton	Fylde	3,745
	Central	Fylde	3,341

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Clifton	Fylde	3,395
	Elswick and Little Eccleston	Fylde	1,291
	Fairhaven	Fylde	3,463
	Freckleton East	Fylde	2,449
	Freckleton West	Fylde	2,225
	Heyhouses	Fylde	4,038
	Kilnhouse	Fylde	3,136
	Kirkham North	Fylde	3,501
	Kirkham South	Fylde	2,024
	Medlar-with-Wesham	Fylde	3,053
	Newton and Treales	Fylde	2,519
	Park	Fylde	4,147
	Ribby-with-Wrea	Fylde	1,446
	Singleton and Greenhalgh	Fylde	1,174
	St. Johns	Fylde	3,656
	St. Leonards	Fylde	3,604
	Staining and Weeton	Fylde	2,489
	Warton and Westby	Fylde	4,721
	Breck	Wyre	3,303
	Hardhorn with High Cross	Wyre	5,444
	Tithebarn	Wyre	3,471
Gorton and Denton BC			74,306
	Burnage	Manchester	12,808
	Gorton & Abbey Hey	Manchester	11,902
	Levenshulme	Manchester	11,795
	Longsight	Manchester	11,600
	Denton North East	Tameside	8,438
	Denton South	Tameside	8,451
	Denton West	Tameside	9,312
Hazel Grove CC			72,941
	Bredbury and Woodley	Stockport	10,582
	Bredbury Green and Romiley	Stockport	11,009
	Hazel Grove	Stockport	10,872
	Manor	Stockport	10,437
	Marple North	Stockport	9,770
	Marple South and High Lane	Stockport	9,976
	Offerton	Stockport	10,295

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Heywood CC			73,306
	Bamford	Rochdale	7,832
	Castleton	Rochdale	7,900
	Hopwood Hall	Rochdale	8,347
	Norden	Rochdale	7,902
	North Heywood	Rochdale	7,834
	North Middleton	Rochdale	7,652
	Spotland and Falinge	Rochdale	8,204
	West Heywood	Rochdale	8,747
	West Middleton	Rochdale	8,888
Hyndburn CC			71,145
	Altham	Hyndburn	4,195
	Barnfield	Hyndburn	3,434
	Baxenden	Hyndburn	3,323
	Central	Hyndburn	3,897
	Church	Hyndburn	3,455
	Clayton-le-Moors	Hyndburn	3,685
	Huncoat	Hyndburn	3,705
	Immanuel	Hyndburn	3,652
	Milnshaw	Hyndburn	3,781
	Netherton	Hyndburn	3,469
	Overton	Hyndburn	5,157
	Peel	Hyndburn	3,171
	Rishton	Hyndburn	5,335
	Spring Hill	Hyndburn	3,665
	St. Andrew's	Hyndburn	3,542
	St. Oswald's	Hyndburn	5,166
	Greenfield	Rossendale	4,332
	Worsley	Rossendale	4,181
Knowsley BC			71,228
	Cherryfield	Knowsley	8,220
	Northwood	Knowsley	8,549
	Prescot North	Knowsley	8,185
	Roby	Knowsley	7,669
	Shevington	Knowsley	8,004
	St. Gabriels	Knowsley	7,390
	St. Michaels	Knowsley	7,111
	Stockbridge	Knowsley	7,949
	Whitefield	Knowsley	8,151

Constituency Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Lancaster and Wyre CC		74,992
Bulk	Lancaster	6,714
Castle	Lancaster	4,848
Ellel	Lancaster	3,600
John O'Gaunt	Lancaster	6,129
Marsh	Lancaster	4,205
Scotforth East	Lancaster	3,389
Scotforth West	Lancaster	5,646
Skerton East	Lancaster	4,912
Skerton West	Lancaster	5,163
University & Scotforth Rural	Lancaster	3,238
Brock with Catterall	Wyre	3,501
Calder	Wyre	1,913
Garstang	Wyre	5,747
Great Eccleston	Wyre	3,408
Hambleton & Stalmine	Wyre	3,757
Pilling	Wyre	2,116
Preesall	Wyre	4,827
Wyresdale	Wyre	1,879
Leigh and Atherton BC		76,363
Atherleigh – part of (polling districts LCB, LCC, LCD, LCE, and part of LCA)	Wigan	7,387
Atherton	Wigan	10,962
Golborne and Lowton West	Wigan	8,962
Leigh East	Wigan	9,039
Leigh South	Wigan	10,324
Leigh West – part of (polling districts LDB, LDC, LDD, LDE, and LDF)	Wigan	9,326
Lowton East	Wigan	10,129
Tyldesley	Wigan	10,234
Liverpool Garston BC		70,372
Allerton and Hunts Cross	Liverpool	11,556
Belle Vale	Liverpool	11,746
Church	Liverpool	10,688
Cressington	Liverpool	11,829
Speke-Garston	Liverpool	13,664
Woolton	Liverpool	10,889

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Liverpool Riverside BC			70,157
	Anfield	Liverpool	9,061
	Central	Liverpool	12,669
	Everton	Liverpool	10,666
	Kirkdale	Liverpool	11,406
	Princes Park	Liverpool	11,169
	Riverside	Liverpool	15,186
Liverpool Walton BC			71,181
	Clubmoor	Liverpool	11,172
	County	Liverpool	9,222
	Croxteth	Liverpool	10,411
	Fazakerley	Liverpool	11,513
	Norris Green	Liverpool	12,054
	Warbreck	Liverpool	11,241
	Molyneux – part of (polling districts C4, C5 and C6)	Sefton	5,568
Liverpool Wavertree BC			71,076
	Childwall	Liverpool	11,058
	Greenbank	Liverpool	10,425
	Kensington and Fairfield	Liverpool	9,125
	Mossley Hill	Liverpool	9,159
	Picton	Liverpool	10,747
	St. Michael's	Liverpool	9,942
	Wavertree	Liverpool	10,620
Liverpool West Derby BC			70,730
	Page Moss	Knowsley	8,165
	Swanside	Knowsley	7,692
	Knotty Ash	Liverpool	10,588
	Old Swan	Liverpool	11,330
	Tuebrook and Stoneycroft	Liverpool	10,161
	West Derby	Liverpool	11,130
	Yew Tree	Liverpool	11,664
Macclesfield CC			75,881
	Bollington	Cheshire East	7,012
	Broken Cross and Upton	Cheshire East	6,792
	Disley	Cheshire East	3,994
	Gawsworth	Cheshire East	3,446
	Macclesfield Central	Cheshire East	7,048
	Macclesfield East	Cheshire East	3,595

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Macclesfield Hurdsfield	Cheshire East	3,423
	Macclesfield South	Cheshire East	6,449
	Macclesfield Tytherington	Cheshire East	7,310
	Macclesfield West and Ivy	Cheshire East	6,306
	Poynton East and Pott Shrigley	Cheshire East	6,286
	Poynton West and Adlington	Cheshire East	6,926
	Prestbury	Cheshire East	3,707
	Sutton	Cheshire East	3,587
Makerfield BC			76,517
	Abram	Wigan	10,375
	Ashton	Wigan	8,902
	Atherleigh – part of (part of polling district LCA)	Wigan	989
	Bryn	Wigan	8,858
	Hindley	Wigan	9,615
	Hindley Green	Wigan	8,807
	Leigh West – part of (polling district LDA)	Wigan	1,128
	Orrell	Wigan	9,620
	Winstanley	Wigan	9,227
	Worsley Mesnes	Wigan	8,996
Manchester Blackley BC			71,375
	Charlestown	Manchester	11,401
	Crumpsall	Manchester	10,220
	Harpurhey	Manchester	11,125
	Higher Blackley	Manchester	10,600
	Moston	Manchester	12,262
	East Middleton	Rochdale	7,967
	South Middleton	Rochdale	7,800
Manchester Central BC			75,311
	Ancoats & Beswick	Manchester	10,697
	Cheetham	Manchester	11,490
	Clayton & Openshaw	Manchester	11,200
	Deansgate	Manchester	7,111
	Miles Platting & Newton Heath	Manchester	12,140
	Piccadilly	Manchester	7,023
	Failsworth East	Oldham	7,875
	Failsworth West	Oldham	7,775

Constituency Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Manchester Rusholme BC		70,692
Ardwick	Manchester	11,766
Fallowfield	Manchester	11,556
Hulme	Manchester	11,949
Moss Side	Manchester	12,783
Rusholme	Manchester	11,789
Whalley Range	Manchester	10,849
Manchester Withington BC		71,614
Chorlton	Manchester	10,868
Chorlton Park	Manchester	13,095
Didsbury East	Manchester	11,363
Didsbury West	Manchester	12,526
Old Moat	Manchester	11,950
Withington	Manchester	11,812
Mid Cheshire CC		69,775
Middlewich	Cheshire East	11,230
Davenham, Moulton & Kingsmead	Cheshire West and Chester	8,465
Hartford & Greenbank	Cheshire West and Chester	6,784
Northwich Leftwich	Cheshire West and Chester	3,686
Northwich Winnington & Castle	Cheshire West and Chester	6,679
Northwich Witton	Cheshire West and Chester	3,741
Rudheath	Cheshire West and Chester	4,078
Winsford Dene	Cheshire West and Chester	3,785
Winsford Gravel	Cheshire West and Chester	3,290
Winsford Over & Verdin	Cheshire West and Chester	10,699
Winsford Swanlow	Cheshire West and Chester	3,643
Winsford Wharton	Cheshire West and Chester	3,695
Morecambe and Lunesdale CC		76,040
Bare	Lancaster	5,625
Bolton & Slyne	Lancaster	6,109
Carnforth & Millhead	Lancaster	4,671

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Halton-with-Aughton	Lancaster	2,105
	Harbour	Lancaster	5,228
	Heysham Central	Lancaster	3,457
	Heysham North	Lancaster	3,328
	Heysham South	Lancaster	5,187
	Kellet	Lancaster	1,798
	Lower Lune Valley	Lancaster	3,694
	Overton	Lancaster	1,881
	Poulton	Lancaster	3,618
	Silverdale	Lancaster	1,686
	Torrisholme	Lancaster	3,688
	Upper Lune Valley	Lancaster	1,998
	Warton	Lancaster	1,705
	Westgate	Lancaster	5,443
	Arnside & Milnthorpe	South Lakeland	5,104
	Burton & Crooklands	South Lakeland	4,790
	Sedbergh & Kirkby Lonsdale	South Lakeland	4,925
Oldham East and Saddleworth CC			72,997
	Alexandra	Oldham	6,952
	Crompton	Oldham	8,227
	Saddleworth North	Oldham	7,943
	Saddleworth South	Oldham	8,453
	Saddleworth West and Lees	Oldham	8,554
	Shaw	Oldham	7,604
	St. James'	Oldham	7,928
	St. Mary's	Oldham	8,986
	Waterhead	Oldham	8,350
Oldham West and Royton BC			74,183
	Chadderton Central	Oldham	8,133
	Chadderton North	Oldham	8,495
	Chadderton South	Oldham	8,036
	Coldhurst	Oldham	8,605
	Hollinwood	Oldham	7,760
	Medlock Vale	Oldham	8,694
	Royton North	Oldham	7,780
	Royton South	Oldham	8,307
	Werneth	Oldham	8,373
Pendle and Clitheroe CC			76,941
	Barnoldswick	Pendle	6,646

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Barrowford & Pendleside	Pendle	6,064
	Boulsworth & Foulridge	Pendle	6,286
	Bradley	Pendle	5,478
	Earby & Coates	Pendle	6,520
	Fence & Higham	Pendle	1,957
	Marsden & Southfield	Pendle	5,466
	Vivary Bridge	Pendle	5,373
	Waterside & Horsfield	Pendle	5,638
	Whitefield & Walverden	Pendle	5,902
	Chatburn	Ribble Valley	1,155
	East Whalley, Read & Simonstone	Ribble Valley	2,266
	Edisford & Low Moor	Ribble Valley	2,724
	Littlemoor	Ribble Valley	2,478
	Primrose	Ribble Valley	2,547
	Sabden	Ribble Valley	1,240
	Salthill	Ribble Valley	2,696
	St. Mary's	Ribble Valley	2,442
	Whalley & Painter Wood	Ribble Valley	2,399
	Wiswell & Barrow	Ribble Valley	1,664
Penrith and Solway CC			76,773
	All Saints	Allerdale	4,441
	Allhallow & Waverton	Allerdale	1,525
	Aspatria	Allerdale	3,025
	Boltons	Allerdale	1,595
	Broughton St. Bridgets	Allerdale	3,158
	Christchurch	Allerdale	3,291
	Ellen & Gilcruix	Allerdale	3,120
	Flimby	Allerdale	1,370
	Marsh & Wampool	Allerdale	3,170
	Maryport North	Allerdale	4,337
	Maryport South	Allerdale	3,061
	Seaton & Northside	Allerdale	4,830
	Silloth & Solway Coast	Allerdale	4,531
	Warnell	Allerdale	1,587
	Wigton & Woodside	Allerdale	5,112
	Dalston & Burgh	Carlisle	6,036
	Alston Moor	Eden	1,679
	Hartside	Eden	1,137
	Hesket	Eden	2,506

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Kirkoswald	Eden	1,173
	Langwathby	Eden	1,270
	Lazonby	Eden	1,281
	Penrith Carleton	Eden	1,536
	Penrith East	Eden	2,324
	Penrith North	Eden	3,345
	Penrith Pategill	Eden	999
	Penrith South	Eden	1,935
	Penrith West	Eden	2,183
	Skelton	Eden	1,216
Preston BC			72,946
	Ashton	Preston	6,354
	Brookfield	Preston	5,490
	Cadley	Preston	6,022
	City Centre	Preston	6,939
	Deepdale	Preston	6,051
	Fishwick & Frenchwood	Preston	5,432
	Garrison	Preston	6,682
	Ingol & Cottam	Preston	6,451
	Lea & Larches	Preston	6,454
	Plungington	Preston	6,504
	Ribbleton	Preston	5,420
	St. Matthew's	Preston	5,147
Ribble Valley CC			75,993
	Greyfriars	Preston	6,344
	Preston Rural East	Preston	6,027
	Preston Rural North	Preston	4,860
	Sharoe Green	Preston	6,206
	Alston & Hothersall	Ribble Valley	2,114
	Billington & Langho	Ribble Valley	2,674
	Bowland	Ribble Valley	1,286
	Brockhall & Dinckley	Ribble Valley	1,304
	Chipping	Ribble Valley	1,188
	Clayton-le-Dale & Salesbury	Ribble Valley	1,352
	Derby & Thornley	Ribble Valley	2,442
	Dilworth	Ribble Valley	2,196
	Gisburn & Rimington	Ribble Valley	1,205
	Hurst Green & Whitewell	Ribble Valley	1,106
	Mellor	Ribble Valley	2,418
	Ribchester	Ribble Valley	1,294

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Waddington, Bashall Eaves & Mitton	Ribble Valley	1,274
	West Bradford & Grindleton	Ribble Valley	1,367
	Whalley Nethertown	Ribble Valley	1,169
	Wilpshire & Ramsgreave	Ribble Valley	2,803
	Bamber Bridge East	South Ribble	3,467
	Bamber Bridge West	South Ribble	3,095
	Coupe Green & Gregson Lane	South Ribble	3,491
	Lostock Hall	South Ribble	5,179
	Samlesbury & Walton	South Ribble	3,284
	Walton-le-Dale East	South Ribble	3,464
	Walton-le-Dale West	South Ribble	3,384
Rochdale CC			71,697
	Balderstone and Kirkholt	Rochdale	7,611
	Central Rochdale	Rochdale	7,284
	Healey	Rochdale	8,052
	Kingsway	Rochdale	8,958
	Littleborough Lakeside	Rochdale	7,996
	Milkstone and Deeplish	Rochdale	7,670
	Milnrow and Newhey	Rochdale	8,058
	Smallbridge and Firgrove	Rochdale	7,931
	Wardle and West Littleborough	Rochdale	8,137
Rossendale and Darwen CC			74,593
	Blackburn South & Lower Darwen	Blackburn with Darwen	5,737
	Darwen East	Blackburn with Darwen	6,274
	Darwen South	Blackburn with Darwen	6,138
	Darwen West	Blackburn with Darwen	6,402
	West Pennine	Blackburn with Darwen	6,287
	Cribden	Rossendale	2,852
	Eden	Rossendale	2,842
	Facit and Shawforth	Rossendale	2,819
	Goodshaw	Rossendale	3,186
	Greensclough	Rossendale	4,391
	Hareholme	Rossendale	4,188
	Healey and Whitworth	Rossendale	3,007

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Helmshore	Rossendale	4,756
	Irwell	Rossendale	4,197
	Longholme	Rossendale	4,419
	Stacksteads	Rossendale	2,870
	Whitewell	Rossendale	4,228
Runcorn and Helsby CC			70,950
	Frodsham	Cheshire West and Chester	7,631
	Gowy Rural	Cheshire West and Chester	7,407
	Helsby	Cheshire West and Chester	4,246
	Sandstone	Cheshire West and Chester	4,159
	Beechwood & Heath	Halton	6,136
	Bridgewater	Halton	5,569
	Daresbury, Moore & Sandymoor	Halton	3,525
	Grange	Halton	5,797
	Halton Castle	Halton	4,939
	Halton Lea	Halton	5,081
	Mersey & Weston	Halton	5,699
	Norton North	Halton	5,714
	Norton South & Preston Brook	Halton	5,047
Salford BC			72,169
	Blackfriars & Trinity	Salford	6,131
	Broughton	Salford	8,256
	Claremont	Salford	9,725
	Ordsall	Salford	6,137
	Pendlebury & Clifton	Salford	8,809
	Pendleton & Charlestown	Salford	8,604
	Quays	Salford	5,090
	Swinton Park	Salford	9,289
	Weaste & Seedley	Salford	10,128
Sefton Central CC			74,746
	Ainsdale	Sefton	10,229
	Blundellsands	Sefton	9,568
	Harington	Sefton	9,970
	Manor	Sefton	10,089

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Molyneux – part of (polling districts C1, C2, C3)	Sefton	4,745
	Park	Sefton	9,942
	Ravenmeols	Sefton	9,818
	Sudell	Sefton	10,385
South Ribble CC			72,029
	Croston, Mawdesley & Euxton South	Chorley	6,187
	Eccleston, Heskin & Charnock Richard	Chorley	5,932
	Broad Oak	South Ribble	3,541
	Broadfield	South Ribble	3,667
	Buckshaw & Worden	South Ribble	3,761
	Charnock	South Ribble	2,932
	Earnshaw Bridge	South Ribble	3,473
	Farington East	South Ribble	3,316
	Farington West	South Ribble	3,188
	Hoole	South Ribble	3,360
	Howick & Priory	South Ribble	5,627
	Leyland Central	South Ribble	3,554
	Longton & Hutton West	South Ribble	4,685
	Middleforth	South Ribble	5,520
	Moss Side	South Ribble	3,107
	New Longton & Hutton East	South Ribble	3,864
	Seven Stars	South Ribble	3,080
	St. Ambrose	South Ribble	3,235
Southport CC			74,168
	Birkdale	Sefton	10,285
	Cambridge	Sefton	9,960
	Duke's	Sefton	10,225
	Kew	Sefton	10,009
	Meols	Sefton	10,074
	Norwood	Sefton	10,255
	Hesketh-with-Becconsall	West Lancashire	3,226
	North Meols	West Lancashire	3,567
	Rufford	West Lancashire	1,806
	Tarleton	West Lancashire	4,761
St Helens North CC			76,082
	Billinge and Seneley Green	St Helens	8,682
	Blackbrook	St Helens	8,003

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Earlestown	St Helens	8,952
	Haydock	St Helens	8,881
	Moss Bank	St Helens	8,622
	Newton	St Helens	9,568
	Parr	St Helens	8,589
	Rainford	St Helens	6,681
	Windle	St Helens	8,104
St Helens South and Whiston BC			70,937
	Prescot South	Knowsley	7,411
	Whiston & Cronton – part of (polling district WC5)	Knowsley	1,394
	Bold	St Helens	7,621
	Eccleston	St Helens	9,674
	Rainhill	St Helens	9,007
	Sutton	St Helens	9,005
	Thatto Heath	St Helens	10,059
	Town Centre	St Helens	7,830
	West Park	St Helens	8,936
Stalybridge and Hyde CC			73,028
	Dukinfield Stalybridge	Tameside	8,639
	Hyde Godley	Tameside	9,064
	Hyde Newton	Tameside	10,655
	Hyde Werneth	Tameside	9,215
	Longdendale	Tameside	8,022
	Mossley	Tameside	9,093
	Stalybridge North	Tameside	9,546
	Stalybridge South	Tameside	8,794
Stockport BC			74,769
	Brinnington and Central	Stockport	10,630
	Davenport and Cale Green	Stockport	10,915
	Edgeley and Cheadle Heath	Stockport	10,385
	Heatons North	Stockport	11,028
	Heatons South	Stockport	10,844
	Reddish North	Stockport	10,591
	Reddish South	Stockport	10,376
Stretford and Urmston BC			73,212
	Bucklow-St. Martins	Trafford	7,032
	Clifford	Trafford	8,411
	Davyhulme East	Trafford	7,756

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Davyhulme West	Trafford	7,779
	Flixton	Trafford	8,422
	Gorse Hill	Trafford	8,267
	Longford	Trafford	9,120
	Stretford	Trafford	7,854
	Urmston	Trafford	8,571
Tatton CC			75,538
	Alderley Edge	Cheshire East	3,743
	Chelford	Cheshire East	3,660
	Handforth	Cheshire East	7,250
	High Legh	Cheshire East	3,674
	Knutsford	Cheshire East	10,420
	Mobberley	Cheshire East	3,589
	Wilmslow Dean Row	Cheshire East	3,807
	Wilmslow East	Cheshire East	3,294
	Wilmslow Lacey Green	Cheshire East	3,631
	Wilmslow West and Chorley	Cheshire East	8,091
	Marbury	Cheshire West and Chester	10,387
	Shakerley	Cheshire West and Chester	4,044
	Lymm North & Thelwall – part of (polling districts SNA, SNB, SPA, SPB and SPC)	Warrington	4,809
	Lymm South	Warrington	5,139
Wallasey BC			73,054
	Leasowe and Moreton East	Wirral	11,076
	Liscard	Wirral	11,350
	Moreton West and Saughall Massie	Wirral	10,850
	New Brighton	Wirral	11,454
	Seacombe	Wirral	10,178
	Upton – part of (polling districts MA and MB)	Wirral	6,248
	Wallasey	Wirral	11,898
Warrington North CC			72,350
	Birchwood	Warrington	8,072
	Burtonwood & Winwick	Warrington	5,066
	Culcheth, Glazebury & Croft	Warrington	8,813
	Fairfield & Howley	Warrington	7,740
	Orford	Warrington	8,365

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Poplars & Hulme	Warrington	8,393
	Poulton North	Warrington	8,121
	Poulton South	Warrington	4,904
	Rixton & Woolston	Warrington	7,730
	Westbrook	Warrington	5,146
Warrington South CC			76,639
	Appleton	Warrington	8,383
	Bewsey & Whitecross	Warrington	7,557
	Chapelford & Old Hall	Warrington	8,771
	Grappenhall	Warrington	5,531
	Great Sankey North & Whittle Hall	Warrington	7,503
	Great Sankey South	Warrington	8,327
	Latchford East	Warrington	6,238
	Latchford West	Warrington	5,839
	Lymm North & Thelwall – part of (polling districts SNC, SND, SNE and SNF)	Warrington	4,353
	Penketh & Cuerdley	Warrington	8,467
	Stockton Heath	Warrington	5,670
West Lancashire CC			73,652
	Ashurst	West Lancashire	4,844
	Aughton and Downholland	West Lancashire	4,578
	Aughton Park	West Lancashire	3,208
	Bickerstaffe	West Lancashire	1,826
	Birch Green	West Lancashire	2,775
	Burscough East	West Lancashire	3,590
	Burscough West	West Lancashire	3,910
	Derby	West Lancashire	5,530
	Digmoor	West Lancashire	2,786
	Halsall	West Lancashire	1,761
	Knowsley	West Lancashire	4,657
	Moorside	West Lancashire	2,503
	Newburgh	West Lancashire	1,682
	Parbold	West Lancashire	3,108
	Scarisbrick	West Lancashire	3,092
	Scott	West Lancashire	4,676
	Skelmersdale North	West Lancashire	2,862
	Skelmersdale South	West Lancashire	4,601
	Tanhouse	West Lancashire	3,282

Constituency Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
Up Holland	West Lancashire	5,018
Wrightington	West Lancashire	3,363
Westmorland and Lonsdale CC		72,322
Appleby (Appleby)	Eden	994
Appleby (Bongate)	Eden	1,547
Askham	Eden	1,060
Brough	Eden	1,119
Crosby Ravensworth	Eden	1,221
Dacre	Eden	1,206
Eamont	Eden	1,308
Greystoke	Eden	1,185
Kirkby Stephen	Eden	2,054
Kirkby Thore	Eden	1,204
Long Marton	Eden	1,016
Morland	Eden	1,038
Orton with Tebay	Eden	1,163
Ravenstonedale	Eden	803
Shap	Eden	1,083
Ullswater	Eden	1,064
Warcop	Eden	1,090
Ambleside & Grasmere	South Lakeland	3,323
Bowness & Levens	South Lakeland	4,743
Broughton & Coniston – part of (polling districts AF, A0, AP, AQ, AS, AT, AU, BC, BDA, BDB, CX, and DH)	South Lakeland	3,020
Cartmel	South Lakeland	3,271
Grange	South Lakeland	4,739
Kendal East	South Lakeland	5,157
Kendal North	South Lakeland	3,280
Kendal Rural	South Lakeland	4,969
Kendal South & Natland	South Lakeland	5,032
Kendal Town	South Lakeland	4,961
Kendal West	South Lakeland	5,145
Windermere	South Lakeland	4,527
Whitehaven and Workington CC		73,332
Crummock & Derwent Valley	Allerdale	1,548
Dalton	Allerdale	1,465
Harrington & Salterbeck	Allerdale	4,650
Keswick	Allerdale	4,599

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Moorclose & Moss Bay	Allerdale	4,731
	St. John's	Allerdale	4,581
	St. Michael's	Allerdale	2,904
	Stainburn & Clifton	Allerdale	2,994
	Arlecdon & Ennerdale	Copeland	3,674
	Beckermet	Copeland	1,690
	Cleator Moor	Copeland	5,217
	Corkickle	Copeland	1,597
	Distington, Lowca & Parton	Copeland	3,073
	Egremont	Copeland	4,681
	Gosforth & Seascale	Copeland	3,306
	Hillcrest	Copeland	4,198
	Kells	Copeland	1,735
	Moor Row & Bigrigg	Copeland	1,792
	Moresby	Copeland	1,488
	Sneckyeat	Copeland	1,743
	St. Bees	Copeland	1,811
	Whitehaven Central	Copeland	4,509
	Whitehaven South	Copeland	5,346
Widnes and Halewood CC			70,865
	Appleton	Halton	4,852
	Bankfield	Halton	5,241
	Birchfield	Halton	6,134
	Central & West Bank	Halton	4,616
	Ditton, Hale Village & Halebank	Halton	5,232
	Farnworth	Halton	6,001
	Halton View	Halton	5,328
	Highfield	Halton	5,241
	Hough Green	Halton	5,464
	Halewood North	Knowsley	8,428
	Halewood South	Knowsley	8,166
	Whiston & Cronton – part of (polling districts WC1, WC1A, WC2, WC3 and WC4)	Knowsley	6,162
Wigan CC			75,607
	Aspull New Springs Whelley	Wigan	9,980
	Douglas	Wigan	9,330
	Ince	Wigan	8,287

Constituency	Ward	Local Authorities	Electorate
	Pemberton	Wigan	9,391
	Shevington with Lower Ground	Wigan	9,374
	Standish with Langtree	Wigan	10,515
	Wigan Central	Wigan	9,214
	Wigan West	Wigan	9,516
Wirral West CC			72,126
	Clatterbridge	Wirral	11,467
	Greasby, Frankby and Irby	Wirral	11,668
	Heswall	Wirral	10,981
	Hoyle and Meols	Wirral	10,723
	Pensby and Thingwall	Wirral	10,575
	Upton – part of (polling districts MC, MD and ME)	Wirral	6,273
	West Kirby and Thurstaston	Wirral	10,439
Worsley and Eccles CC			76,915
	Barton & Winton	Salford	9,896
	Boothstown & Ellenbrook	Salford	9,744
	Cadishead & Lower Irlam	Salford	9,378
	Eccles	Salford	10,619
	Higher Irlam & Peel Green	Salford	9,369
	Swinton & Wardley	Salford	9,093
	Worsley & Westwood Park	Salford	8,918
	Astley Mosley Common	Wigan	9,898
Wythenshawe and Sale East BC			76,971
	Baguley	Manchester	10,800
	Brooklands	Manchester	10,845
	Northenden	Manchester	10,550
	Sharston	Manchester	10,996
	Woodhouse Park	Manchester	10,314
	Brooklands	Trafford	7,881
	Priory	Trafford	8,072
	Sale Moor	Trafford	7,513

Glossary

Assistant Commissioner	Independent person appointed at the request of the BCE to assist it with the discharge of its functions.	Public hearing	Formal opportunity during the secondary consultation period for people to make oral representations, chaired by an Assistant Commissioner.
Borough constituency (abbreviated to BC)	The designation for a Parliamentary constituency containing a predominantly urban area.	Representations	The views provided by an individual, group or organisation to the BCE on its initial or revised proposals (or on the representations of others), either for or against, including counter-proposals and petitions.
County constituency (abbreviated to CC)	The designation for a Parliamentary constituency containing more than a small rural element.	Review date	The ‘effective date’ at which electorate and local government boundary data is fixed so that we can then work with it on a stable basis. Defined by the 2020 Act for the 2023 Review as 2 March 2020 for the electorate numbers, and 1 December 2020 for local government boundaries.
Designation	Official classification as either a borough constituency or a county constituency. The designation of a constituency guides the determination of who the returning officer will be, and determines how much candidates can spend, in any election for that constituency.	Revised proposals	The initial proposals as subsequently revised.
Electorate	The number of registered Parliamentary electors in a given area.	Rules	The statutory criteria for Parliamentary constituencies recommended by a Parliamentary Boundary Commission, as set out in Schedule 2 to the Parliamentary Constituencies Act 1986 (as amended by Acts up to and including the 2020 Act).
(Statutory/ Permitted) Electorate range	The statutory rule that requires the electorate of every recommended constituency to be – for the 2023 Review – between 69,724 and 77,062.	UK electoral quota	The average number of electors in a constituency, found by dividing the total electorate of the UK (less that of the five specific ‘protected’ constituencies in the UK) by 645.
Final recommendations	The recommendations submitted in a formal final report to Parliament at the end of a review. They may – or may not – have been amended since the earlier proposals in any given area.	Unitary authority	An area where there is only one tier of ‘principal area’ local council (above any parish or town council). Contrasted with those ‘shire district’ areas that have two tiers (i.e. both a non-metropolitan county council and a district/borough/city council).
Initial proposals	First formal proposals published by the BCE during the review for public consultation.		
Periodical report	Report to Parliament following a general review of Parliamentary constituencies.		
Places of deposit	In each proposed constituency the Commission will make available hard copies of its revised proposals (including report and maps). The places of deposit where the public may inspect the proposals are usually the offices of the relevant local authority, although other public places such as libraries may be used. The Commission will publish a full list of places of deposit on its website.		

