

# New electoral arrangements for Sefton Council

## Draft Recommendations

January 2024

### **Translations and other formats:**

To get this report in another language or in a large-print or Braille version, please contact the Local Government Boundary Commission for England at:

Tel: 0330 500 1525

Email: [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

### **Licensing:**

The mapping in this report is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Keeper of Public Records © Crown copyright and database right. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and database right.

Licence Number: GD 100049926 2024

### **A note on our mapping:**

The maps shown in this report are for illustrative purposes only. Whilst best efforts have been made by our staff to ensure that the maps included in this report are representative of the boundaries described by the text, there may be slight variations between these maps and the large PDF map that accompanies this report, or the digital mapping supplied on our consultation portal. This is due to the way in which the final mapped products are produced. The reader should therefore refer to either the large PDF supplied with this report or the digital mapping for the true likeness of the boundaries intended. The boundaries as shown on either the large PDF map or the digital mapping should always appear identical.

# Contents

Introduction	1
Who we are and what we do	1
What is an electoral review?	1
Why Sefton?	2
Our proposals for Sefton	2
How will the recommendations affect you?	2
Have your say	3
Review timetable	3
Analysis and draft recommendations	5
Submissions received	5
Electorate figures	5
Number of councillors	6
Ward boundaries consultation	7
Draft recommendations	8
Molyneux, Park and Sudell	9
Ford, Netherton & Orrell and St Oswald	12
Derby, Linacre and Litherland	14
Blundellsands, Church, Manor and Victoria	16
Harington and Ravenmeols	19
Ainsdale, Birkdale, Cambridge, Duke's, Kew, Meols and Norwood	21
Conclusions	25
Summary of electoral arrangements	25
Parish electoral arrangements	25
Have your say	27
Equalities	31
Appendices	33
Appendix A	33
Draft recommendations for Sefton Council	33
Appendix B	35
Outline map	35
Appendix C	36
Submissions received	36
Appendix D	37
Glossary and abbreviations	37



# Introduction

## Who we are and what we do

1 The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) is an independent body set up by Parliament.<sup>1</sup> We are not part of government or any political party. We are accountable to Parliament through a committee of MPs chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Our main role is to carry out electoral reviews of local authorities throughout England.

2 The members of the Commission are:

- Professor Colin Mellors OBE (Chair)
- Andrew Scallan CBE (Deputy Chair)
- Amanda Nobbs OBE
- Steve Robinson
- Wallace Sampson OBE
- Liz Treacy
- Ailsa Irvine (Chief Executive)

## What is an electoral review?

3 An electoral review examines and proposes new electoral arrangements for a local authority. A local authority's electoral arrangements decide:

- How many councillors are needed.
- How many wards or electoral divisions there should be, where their boundaries are and what they should be called.
- How many councillors should represent each ward or division.

4 When carrying out an electoral review the Commission has three main considerations:

- Improving electoral equality by equalising the number of electors that each councillor represents.
- Ensuring that the recommendations reflect community identity.
- Providing arrangements that support effective and convenient local government.

5 Our task is to strike the best balance between these three considerations when making our recommendations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

6 More detail regarding the powers that we have, as well as further guidance and information about electoral reviews and review process in general, can be found on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Why Sefton?

7 We are conducting a review of Sefton Council ('the Council') as its last review was completed in 2003, and we are required to review the electoral arrangements of every council in England 'from time to time'.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, some councillors currently represent many more or fewer electors than others. We describe this as 'electoral inequality'. Our aim is to create 'electoral equality', where the number of electors per councillor is as even as possible, ideally within 10% of being exactly equal.

8 This electoral review is being carried out to ensure that:

- The wards in Sefton are in the best possible places to help the Council carry out its responsibilities effectively.
- The number of electors represented by each councillor is approximately the same across the borough.

## Our proposals for Sefton

9 Sefton should be represented by 66 councillors, the same number as there are now.

10 Sefton should have 22 wards, the same number as there are now.

11 The boundaries of most wards should change.

## How will the recommendations affect you?

12 The recommendations will determine how many councillors will serve on the Council. They will also decide which ward you vote in, which other communities are in that ward, and, in some cases, which parish council ward you vote in. Your ward name may also change.

13 Our recommendations cannot affect the external boundaries of the borough or result in changes to postcodes. They do not take into account parliamentary constituency boundaries. The recommendations will not have an effect on local taxes, house prices, or car and house insurance premiums and we are not able to consider any representations which are based on these issues.

---

<sup>2</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 paragraph 56(1).

## Have your say

14 We will consult on the draft recommendations for a 10-week period, from 9 January 2024 to 18 March 2024. We encourage everyone to use this opportunity to comment on these proposed wards as the more public views we hear, the more informed our decisions will be in making our final recommendations.

15 We ask everyone wishing to contribute ideas for the new wards to first read this report and look at the accompanying map before responding to us.

16 You have until 18 March 2024 to have your say on the draft recommendations. See page 27 for how to send us your response.

## Review timetable

17 We wrote to the Council to ask its views on the appropriate number of councillors for Sefton. We then held a period of consultation with the public on warding patterns for the borough. The submissions received during consultation have informed our draft recommendations.

18 The review is being conducted as follows:

Stage starts	Description
18 July 2023	Number of councillors decided
25 July 2023	Start of consultation seeking views on new wards
2 October 2023	End of consultation; we began analysing submissions and forming draft recommendations
9 January 2024	Publication of draft recommendations; start of second consultation
18 March 2024	End of consultation; we begin analysing submissions and forming final recommendations
4 June 2024	Publication of final recommendations





## Analysis and draft recommendations

19 Legislation<sup>3</sup> states that our recommendations should not be based only on how many electors<sup>4</sup> there are now, but also on how many there are likely to be in the five years after the publication of our final recommendations. We must also try to recommend strong, clearly identifiable boundaries for our wards.

20 In reality, we are unlikely to be able to create wards with exactly the same number of electors in each; we have to be flexible. However, we try to keep the number of electors represented by each councillor as close to the average for the council as possible.

21 We work out the average number of electors per councillor for each individual local authority by dividing the electorate by the number of councillors, as shown on the table below.

	2023	2029
Electorate of Sefton	215,581	226,389
Number of councillors	66	66
Average number of electors per councillor	3,266	3,430

22 When the number of electors per councillor in a ward is within 10% of the average for the authority, we refer to the ward as having 'good electoral equality'. All of our proposed wards for Sefton are forecast to have good electoral equality by 2029.

## Submissions received

23 See Appendix C for details of the submissions received. All submissions may be viewed on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

## Electorate figures

24 The Council submitted electorate forecasts for 2029, a period five years on from the scheduled publication of our final recommendations in 2024. These forecasts were broken down to polling district level and predicted an increase in the electorate of around 5%.

25 We considered the information provided by the Council and are satisfied that the projected figures are the best available at the present time. We have used these figures to produce our draft recommendations.

<sup>3</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

<sup>4</sup> Electors refers to the number of people registered to vote, not the whole adult population.

## Number of councillors

26 Sefton Council currently has 66 councillors. We looked at evidence provided by the Council and Councillor Sir Ron Watson and concluded that keeping this number the same will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

27 We therefore invited proposals for new patterns of wards that would be represented by 66 councillors. As Sefton Council elects by thirds (meaning it has elections in three out of every four years) there is a presumption in legislation<sup>5</sup> that the Council has a uniform pattern of three-councillor wards. In each review of local authorities that elect by thirds, we will aim to deliver a pattern of three-councillor wards. However, in all cases this consideration will not take precedence over our other statutory criteria, and we will not recommend uniform patterns in the number of councillors per ward if, in our view or as is shown in evidence provided to us, it is not compatible with our other statutory criteria.

28 We considered that a suggestion made by the Southport Liberal Democrats and two local residents that wards in the borough could potentially be represented by two councillors each was not supported by strong enough evidence to move away from a three-member warding pattern.

29 During the public consultation on ward boundaries, the Conservative Group on the Council raised concerns about the Council's governance arrangements. It stated that the current Cabinet system is undemocratic and that the Overview & Scrutiny committees and Full Council meetings are not being run effectively. While we do request information pertaining to a Council's governance arrangements from local authorities and political groups when determining the number of councillors for a local authority, we do not have the ability to determine or influence their governance arrangements. Our role is limited to determining the number of councillors for each local authority based on the evidence we receive, and then determining the ward boundaries to accommodate those councillors.

30 We received four further submissions that made reference to the number of councillors in response to our consultation on warding patterns. Two local residents stated that 66 councillors was too many and supported a reduction. The Southport Liberal Democrats and a local resident stated that a reduction of three councillors to 63 would allow for a better balance of electoral equality across the borough. To this end, the Southport Liberal Democrats submitted a borough-wide scheme based upon 63 councillors. However, as explained in detail later in this report, we are not persuaded that sufficient evidence has been presented to support these warding

---

<sup>5</sup> Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development & Construction Act 2009 paragraph 2(3)(d) and paragraph 2(5)(c).

proposals, and therefore a reduction in the number of councillors to 63. Consequently, our draft recommendations are based on a council represented by 66 councillors.

## Ward boundaries consultation

31 We received 29 submissions in response to our consultation on ward boundaries. These included borough-wide proposals from the Labour Group on Sefton Council and the Southport Liberal Democrats.

32 The Conservative Group did not propose a borough-wide scheme. They instead expressed their opposition to a whole-scale internal ward boundary review at this time. They argued that reviewing the entire borough solely because it has been 20 years since the last electoral review was not a compelling reason, especially given that all but one ward currently has good electoral equality. However, as explained in paragraph 7, we are legally mandated to periodically review all local authorities in England, and we believe that 20 years is a reasonable interpretation of this requirement.

33 We also received a submission from a local resident with regard to the whole borough, but they did not explicitly outline how all of the wards should be configured. We have nonetheless noted and adopted some of their suggestions in parts of the borough.

34 The remainder of the submissions provided localised comments for warding arrangements in particular areas of the borough.

35 The two borough-wide schemes provided uniform patterns of three-councillor wards for Sefton. The proposals made by the Labour Group comprised of 22 three-councillor wards for 66 councillors. The Southport Liberal Democrats proposed 21 three councillor wards for 63 councillors. We carefully considered the proposals received and were of the view that the proposed patterns of wards resulted in good levels of electoral equality in most areas of the authority and generally used clearly identifiable boundaries.

36 Our draft recommendations are based predominantly upon the proposals made by the Labour Group, which we consider to provide the best reflection of our statutory criteria. We have also taken into account local evidence that we received, which provided further evidence of community links and locally recognised boundaries. In some areas we considered that the proposals did not provide for the best balance between our statutory criteria, so we identified alternative boundaries.

37 We visited the area in order to look at the various different proposals on the ground. This tour of Sefton helped us to decide between the different boundaries proposed.

38 We also received several submissions that requested that the northern part of the authority be separated from the southern part of the authority. However, as outlined in paragraph 13, this electoral review cannot amend the external boundaries of the borough.

## Draft recommendations

39 Our draft recommendations are for 22 three-councillor wards. We consider that our draft recommendations will provide for electoral equality while reflecting community identities and interests where we received such evidence during consultation.

40 The tables and maps on pages 9–23 detail our draft recommendations for each area of Sefton. They detail how the proposed warding arrangements reflect the three statutory<sup>6</sup> criteria of:

- Equality of representation.
- Reflecting community interests and identities.
- Providing for effective and convenient local government.

41 A summary of our proposed new wards is set out in the table starting on page 33 and on the large map accompanying this report.

42 We welcome all comments on these draft recommendations, particularly on the location of the ward boundaries, and the names of our proposed wards.

---

<sup>6</sup> Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009.

## Molyneux, Park and Sudell



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Molyneux	3	5%
Park	3	10%
Sudell	3	4%

### *Molyneux*

43 The Southport Liberal Democrats proposed to retain the existing Molyneux ward. The Labour Group also proposed to largely retain the existing Molyneux ward, but transferred the area which contained the cul-de-sacs adjacent to Sentinel Way into a Netherton & Orrell ward, placing the boundary along the railway line.

44 While we recognise that the railway line would form a recognisable boundary in this instance, following it would result in us being legally required to create a parish ward for Aintree Village parish that would only contain those electors residing in the aforementioned cul-de-sacs. This is because the Aintree Village parish boundary runs through these cul-de-sacs – if we were to divide the parish between different borough wards, we must also, by law, divide it into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single borough ward. We consider that, in this case, such an arrangement would not facilitate effective and convenient local government because the resulting parish ward would contain very few electors.

45 Maghull Town Council requested that the area of the town currently within Molyneux ward be incorporated into either Park or Sudell wards. This would result in the A59 road forming the boundary between the two latter wards and Maghull parish being represented by six borough councillors, as opposed to the current nine. However, we have decided not to adopt this proposal as it would result in Molyneux ward having a forecast electoral variance of -16% by 2029. We consider that this is too high to accept if we are to ensure good electoral equality across wards.

46 We are therefore recommending the retention of the existing Molyneux ward as part of our draft recommendations.


### *Park and Sudell*

47 The Labour Group and the Southport Liberal Democrats both proposed modifying the boundaries of the existing Park ward, so that the boundary with Sudell ward would follow the A59 road. This would also reflect the request made by Maghull Town Council, which requested that the boundary between Park and Sudell wards follow the A59. This change would also result in a Sudell ward with good electoral equality, noting that the current Sudell ward is forecast to have an electoral variance of 15% by 2029, due to substantial residential development. We agree that the A59 road presents a recognisable boundary in this instance and have incorporated this adjustment into our draft recommendations.

48 The Southport Liberal Democrats suggested that Park ward be renamed Lydiate & Maghull West. We were not persuaded to make this ward name change, but would welcome views on whether this name is preferable and, if so, whether Sudell ward should be renamed Maghull East.

49 Maghull Town Council requested that the M58 forms the boundary between Maghull and Melling parish. However, we do not have the power to modify parish boundaries as part of this review. The authority to make such changes lies with the Borough Council through a Community Governance Review.

## Ford, Netherton & Orrell and St Oswald



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Ford	3	-7%
Netherton & Orrell	3	-9%
St Oswald	3	-7%

### *Ford*

50 The Labour Group proposed retaining the existing Ford ward, while the Southport Liberal Democrats suggested transferring the area east of the Leeds & Liverpool Canal into their proposed Litherland & Orrell ward.

51 We have decided to retain the existing Ford ward as part of our draft recommendations. We consider that the current Litherland and Ford ward boundary, which follows the Leeds & Liverpool Canal, to be a stronger and more recognisable one than that proposed by the Liberal Democrats.

### *Netherton & Orrell and St Oswald*

52 We received contrasting proposals for this area from the Labour Group and Southport Liberal Democrats. The Labour Group proposed a relatively small




amendment to the existing wards, moving the current St Oswald ward boundary along Swifts Lane, Bridge Lane, part of Park Lane West and Leonard Cheshire Drive to follow the A5036 road instead. This would resolve the current and projected level of over-representation in the existing St Oswald ward. The Southport Liberal Democrats' proposal would require the adoption of a 63-councillor warding pattern that would abolish St Oswald ward and create a new Netherton ward. The latter ward would include both sides of the A5036 road, placing the Orrell area in a ward with the Litherland area. The Southport Liberal Democrats' proposal reflected the request of a local resident who stated that Netherton is currently split between wards and that the Orrell area should be in a separate ward from the Netherton area.

53 Given the significant differences between the two borough-wide schemes, we visited the area on our tour of the borough to gain an understanding of the proposals on the ground. After careful consideration of the submitted proposals and our own assessment of the area, we have decided to adopt the Labour Group's proposed warding arrangements. We agree with the Labour Group that the A5036 road represents a strong and readily identifiable boundary. We also consider that the community evidence provided by the Southport Liberal Democrats was not sufficient to justify the reduction in council size that their proposal would necessitate.

54 We have also adopted the Labour Group's proposal to include the Vaux Crescent area in Netherton & Orrell ward. This will ensure the ward has good electoral equality by 2029.

## Derby, Linacre and Litherland



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Derby	3	-8%
Linacre	3	-5%
Litherland	3	-4%

### *Derby and Linacre*

55 The two borough-wide schemes proposed significantly different wards for the Bootle area. While the Labour Group largely maintained the existing east-to-west orientation of the current ward structure, with some modifications, the Southport Liberal Democrats instead proposed the area be split on a north and south basis.

56 The Southport Liberal Democrats proposed new wards called Bootle North and Bootle South which would require the adoption of their wider proposals for 63 councillors, rather than 66. They stated that Bootle North and Bootle South wards would take their names from the North Park and South Park that would sit within each respective ward, with part of Marsh Lane and the old railway line representing identifiable boundaries.

57 We visited this area of the borough to analyse these proposals on the ground. Upon thorough assessment, we have decided to base our proposals on those submitted by the Labour Group. Based upon our visit, and the evidence provided by the Southport Liberal Democrats, we considered there was insufficient community-based evidence to justify either significantly moving away from the existing ward structure or adopting a 63-councillor warding arrangement for the entire borough. As stated earlier in this report, we are minded to support the retention of 66 councillors – a number that we have concluded will ensure the Council can carry out its roles and responsibilities effectively.

58 We have adopted the suggestion made by the Labour Group to use the entirety of Stanley Road as the boundary between Derby and Linacre wards. This will involve transferring electors residing in the area bounded by the borough boundary, Stanley Road, Wadham Road and Miranda Road from Linacre ward to Derby ward. We consider that following the entirety of Stanley Road will establish a more identifiable ward boundary.


#### *Litherland*

59 We have decided to base our draft recommendations on the Labour Group's proposal for Litherland ward, rather than the Southport Liberal Democrats' proposed Litherland & Orrell ward. The Labour Group's Litherland ward is largely based on the existing Litherland ward, which is projected to maintain good electoral equality by 2029.

60 Adopting the Southport Liberal Democrats' Litherland & Orrell ward would have required us to also adopt their Bootle North, Bootle South and Netherton wards as part of a 63-councillor warding arrangement for the borough. However, as explained elsewhere in this report, we deemed the evidence presented by the Southport Liberal Democrats insufficient to warrant a departure from a 66-councillor warding scheme.

61 We have decided not to transfer part of the Monfa Road estate from Derby to Litherland ward. This is because, by our calculations, this would result in Derby ward being over-represented. Retaining the existing boundary along Province Road and Menai Road will ensure that our Derby ward is anticipated to have good electoral equality by 2029.

## Blundellsands, Church, Manor and Victoria



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Blundellsands	3	-3%
Church	3	-4%
Manor	3	6%
Victoria	3	-6%

### *Blundellsands and Victoria*

62 Both the Labour Group and the Southport Liberal Democrats proposed modifications to the current Blundellsands and Victoria wards to ensure good electoral equality across wards. The Labour Group suggested relocating the boundary between Blundellsands ward and Manor ward from Little Crosby Road to Oaklands Avenue to reduce the forecast electoral variance of Manor ward, while the Southport Liberal Democrats proposed shifting the boundary between Blundellsands and Victoria wards from the railway line and Mersey Road to College Road and Brooke Road East.

63 We have chosen to adopt the proposals presented by the Labour Group as part of our draft recommendations. For reasons outlined in the Church section below, our decision to move the current boundary between Church and Victoria wards from St John's Road to the edge of Victoria Park would mean implementing the Southport

Liberal Democrats' proposal for Blundellsands and Victoria wards and would result in Victoria ward being over-represented. This would contradict our statutory requirement for ensuring electoral equality across wards.

64 Two local residents expressed concern about the existing boundary between Victoria and Manor wards, which places each side of Forefield Lane in different wards and parliamentary constituencies. However, no alternative ward boundary proposal was suggested. As a result, we have decided to retain the current boundary in our draft recommendations.

65 A local resident on Manor Avenue, which is currently in Blundellsands ward, stated that they possess a stronger affinity to the Crosby Village area than with Blundellsands. They proposed creating a new Crosby Village ward by combining parts of the existing Blundellsands, Manor and Victoria wards. We have decided not to adopt this proposal as it would necessitate transferring a significant portion of our proposed Blundellsands ward to the new Crosby Village ward, resulting in a high electoral variance in the resulting Blundellsands ward.

### *Church*

66 The Labour Group and Southport Liberal Democrats proposed different boundary modifications for Church ward. The Labour Group suggested shifting the boundary with Victoria ward from St John's Road to the edge of Victoria Park and extending the southern boundary along Princess Way northward, roughly following Claremont Road. This proposal, according to the Labour Group, would allow the Seaforth community to be included in Linacre ward.

67 As an alternative, the Southport Liberal Democrats proposed extending the existing Church ward southward, towards Seaforth Road. They argued that this would place the Seaforth area within Church ward.

68 We have decided to adopt the Labour Group's proposals for Church ward. We agree that following the edge of Victoria Park provides a more easily identifiable boundary between Church and Victoria wards than the current one along St John's Road. Additionally, we find the southern boundary of the Labour Group's Church ward to be somewhat more recognisable than the one proposed by the Southport Liberal Democrats. We have nonetheless modified the Labour Group's proposal so that it follows a more identifiable boundary along Claremont Road and Sandy Road.

69 A local resident pointed out that the current Church ward encompasses portions of the Waterloo and Seaforth communities but does not fully include either. On the basis of the evidence we have received so far, we consider that our proposed Church ward will effectively reflect the identities and interests of these two communities. However, we would particularly encourage feedback on this ward

during the current consultation period and any alternatives that we can accommodate within the wider warding pattern for the borough.


### *Manor*

70 The Southport Liberal Democrats did not propose any changes to the current Manor ward. The Labour Group proposed a minor modification to the boundary with Blundellsands ward, suggesting it move from Little Crosby Road to Oaklands Avenue. A local resident also suggested that electors in this area be transferred from Manor ward to Blundellsands ward. We have adopted the Labour Group's modification to achieve a better level of electoral equality for Manor ward.

71 We have also decided to include Sefton parish in Manor ward, as per a local resident's suggestion. This will ensure that our Park ward maintains good electoral equality by 2029 and it will bring the entirety of Sefton parish under a single ward, which will promote effective and convenient local governance.

72 Thornton Parish Council requested significant alterations to their parish boundaries. We cannot recommend any changes to parish boundaries as part of this electoral review; this responsibility lies with the Borough Council through a Community Governance Review. However, we note that the area Thornton Parish Council wishes to incorporate into the parish will fall entirely within our proposed Manor ward. This means that the ward will encompass the entirety of Thornton parish if a future Community Governance Review decides to adopt the exact boundary arrangement requested by Thornton Parish Council.

## Harington and Ravenmeols



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Harington	3	0%
Ravenmeols	3	-1%

### *Harington and Ravenmeols*

73 Both the Labour Group and the Southport Liberal Democrats proposed no alterations to these wards, as they are projected to maintain excellent levels of electoral equality by 2029. Consequently, we recommend the retention of these two wards in our draft recommendations, bar a very minor modification to reflect road access routes.


74 A local resident proposed reorganising the existing wards into new Freshfield and Formby wards. We did not adopt this proposal due to the lack of clarity regarding the boundaries of the two proposed wards. However, we encourage views on whether new Freshfield and Formby wards would be a better option and, if so, what their boundaries would be.

75 A local resident stated that Formby parish should be represented by a single ward that also incorporated Little Altcar parish, which could then allow Hightown and Ince Blundell parishes to form a separate ward. Another local resident requested that Harington ward include the whole of Formby. We decided not to adopt this proposal as a ward the size of Formby and Little Altcar parishes would necessitate six councillors to achieve good electoral equality. We consider that a ward represented by more than three councillors does not aid effective and convenient local government and potentially dilutes the accountability of elected councillors to the electorate. We also consider the evidence supplied was not persuasive enough for us to depart from the presumption that the borough be represented by a uniform pattern of three-councillor wards.

76 Formby Town Council and Little Altcar Parish Council requested that two parishes be amalgamated. However, we are unable to merge parishes as part of this review. The authority to implement such changes lies with the Borough Council through a Community Governance Review.



# Ainsdale, Birkdale, Cambridge, Duke's, Kew, Meols and Norwood



Ward name	Number of councillors	Variance 2029
Ainsdale	3	3%
Birkdale	3	1%
Cambridge	3	-2%
Duke's	3	8%
Kew	3	9%
Meols	3	4%
Norwood	3	6%

#### *Ainsdale and Meols*

77 Both the Labour Group and the Southport Liberal Democrats proposed no changes to these two wards, as they are projected to maintain good electoral equality by 2029. Therefore, we recommend retaining these two wards in our draft recommendations.

#### *Birkdale and Kew*

78 The Southport Liberal Democrats proposed no change to these wards. The Labour Group suggested moving several roads connected to Upper Aughton Road from Kew ward to Birkdale ward to improve the level of electoral equality for Kew ward. We were not persuaded to make this amendment as we consider that Upper Aughton Road represents a strong, recognisable boundary. We considered that this factor outweighed the relatively small improvement in electoral equality that a change would provide.

79 We have nonetheless modified the boundary between the two wards to ensure that future residential development near the garden centre will fall entirely in Birkdale ward.

#### *Cambridge, Duke's and Norwood*

80 The Southport Liberal Democrats did not propose any changes to these wards. The Labour Group, however, proposed some modifications to improve electoral equality. The group suggested transferring the area bounded by the Promenade, Leicester Street, Lord Street and Seabank Road from Duke's ward to Cambridge ward. Additionally, it proposed that both sides of Zetland Street should be included in Duke's ward. These changes, it was argued, would lead to a more even distribution of electors across the three wards.

81 We decided against adopting these modifications. We consider that the current boundaries along Leicester Street, the Promenade and Zetland Street are more recognisable and well-defined than those proposed by the Labour Group. We therefore agree with the Southport Liberal Democrats' assessment that no changes

are necessary to the boundaries of Cambridge, Duke's and Norwood wards, bar two small changes to reflect road access routes between Kew and Norwood wards.

82 A local resident suggested creating a new ward centred on and named after the Blowick community, as they argued that the current Kew and Norwood wards divide the community. We did not adopt this proposal because the local resident did not specifically detail how this ward would be configured, in respect of its exact boundaries.



## Conclusions

83 The table below provides a summary as to the impact of our draft recommendations on electoral equality in Sefton, referencing the 2023 and 2029 electorate figures against the proposed number of councillors and wards. A full list of wards, names and their corresponding electoral variances can be found at Appendix A to the back of this report. An outline map of the wards is provided at Appendix B.

### Summary of electoral arrangements

	Draft recommendations	
	2023	2029
Number of councillors	66	66
Number of electoral wards	22	22
Average number of electors per councillor	3,266	3,430
Number of wards with a variance more than 10% from the average	0	0
Number of wards with a variance more than 20% from the average	0	0

#### Draft recommendations

Sefton Council should be made up of 66 councillors serving 22 three-councillor wards. The details and names are shown in Appendix A and illustrated on the large maps accompanying this report.

#### Mapping

You can also view our draft recommendations for Sefton Council on our interactive maps at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

### Parish electoral arrangements

84 As part of an electoral review, we are required to have regard to the statutory criteria set out in Schedule 2 to the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (the 2009 Act). The Schedule provides that if a parish is to be divided between different wards it must also be divided into parish wards, so that each parish ward lies wholly within a single ward. We cannot recommend changes to the external boundaries of parishes as part of an electoral review.

85 Under the 2009 Act we only have the power to make changes to parish electoral arrangements where these are as a direct consequence of our

recommendations for principal authority warding arrangements. However, Sefton Council has powers under the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 to conduct community governance reviews to effect changes to parish electoral arrangements.

86 As a result of our proposed ward boundaries and having regard to the statutory criteria set out in schedule 2 to the 2009 Act, we are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Maghull.

87 We are providing revised parish electoral arrangements for Maghull parish.

#### Draft recommendations

Maghull Town Council should comprise 16 councillors, as at present, representing four wards:

Parish ward	Number of parish councillors
East	6
North	3
South	2
West	5

88 Maghull Town Council requested that their parish wards each be represented by four parish councillors each. However, our approach is to allocate the current total number of councillors to each parish ward based on the five-year electorate forecast. We consider that changing the total number of councillors for a parish ward in the way the Town Council prefers is best resolved locally, and the Borough Council has the power to make such changes via a Community Governance Review.

## Have your say

89 The Commission has an open mind about its draft recommendations. Every representation we receive will be considered, regardless of who it is from or whether it relates to the whole borough or just a part of it.

90 If you agree with our recommendations, please let us know. If you don't think our recommendations are right for Sefton, we want to hear alternative proposals for a different pattern of wards.

91 Our website is the best way to keep up to date with progress on the review and to have your say [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

92 Each review has its own page with details of the timetable for the review, information about its different stages and interactive mapping.

93 Submissions can also be made by emailing [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk) or by writing to:

**Review Officer (Sefton)**  
**LGBCE**  
**PO Box 133**  
**Blyth**  
**NE24 9FE**

94 The Commission aims to propose a pattern of wards for Sefton which delivers:

- Electoral equality: each local councillor represents a similar number of electors.
- Community identity: reflects the identity and interests of local communities.
- Effective and convenient local government: helping your council discharge its responsibilities effectively.

95 A good pattern of wards should:

- Provide good electoral equality, with each councillor representing, as closely as possible, the same number of electors.
- Reflect community interests and identities and include evidence of community links.
- Be based on strong, easily identifiable boundaries.
- Help the council deliver effective and convenient local government.

96 Electoral equality:

- Does your proposal mean that councillors would represent roughly the same number of electors as elsewhere in Sefton?

97 Community identity:

- Community groups: is there a parish council, residents' association or other group that represents the area?
- Interests: what issues bind the community together or separate it from other parts of your area?
- Identifiable boundaries: are there natural or constructed features which make strong boundaries for your proposals?

98 Effective local government:

- Are any of the proposed wards too large or small to be represented effectively?
- Are the proposed names of the wards appropriate?
- Are there good links across your proposed wards? Is there any form of public transport?

99 Please note that the consultation stages of an electoral review are public consultations. In the interests of openness and transparency, we make available for public inspection full copies of all representations the Commission takes into account as part of a review. Accordingly, copies of all representations will be placed on deposit at our offices and on our website at [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk) A list of respondents will be available from us on request after the end of the consultation period.

100 If you are a member of the public and not writing on behalf of a council or organisation we will remove any personal identifiers. This includes your name, postal or email addresses, signatures or phone numbers from your submission before it is made public. We will remove signatures from all letters, no matter who they are from.

101 In the light of representations received, we will review our draft recommendations and consider whether they should be altered. As indicated earlier, it is therefore important that all interested parties let us have their views and evidence, **whether or not** they agree with the draft recommendations. We will then publish our final recommendations.

102 After the publication of our final recommendations, the changes we have proposed must be approved by Parliament. An Order – the legal document which brings into force our recommendations – will be laid in draft in Parliament. The draft



Order will provide for new electoral arrangements to be implemented at the all-out elections for Sefton Council in 2026.



## Equalities

103 The Commission has looked at how it carries out reviews under the guidelines set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. It has made best endeavours to ensure that people with protected characteristics can participate in the review process and is sufficiently satisfied that no adverse equality impacts will arise as a result of the outcome of the review.



# Appendices

## Appendix A

### Draft recommendations for Sefton Council

	Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2023)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
1	Ainsdale	3	10,158	3,386	4%	10,634	3,545	3%
2	Birkdale	3	10,212	3,404	4%	10,428	3,476	1%
3	Blundellsands	3	9,827	3,276	0%	10,022	3,341	-3%
4	Cambridge	3	9,893	3,298	1%	10,130	3,377	-2%
5	Church	3	9,599	3,200	-2%	9,854	3,285	-4%
6	Derby	3	9,193	3,064	-6%	9,487	3,162	-8%
7	Duke's	3	10,630	3,543	8%	11,148	3,716	8%
8	Ford	3	9,334	3,111	-5%	9,535	3,178	-7%
9	Harington	3	9,949	3,316	2%	10,258	3,419	0%
10	Kew	3	10,428	3,476	6%	11,203	3,734	9%
11	Linacre	3	9,364	3,121	-4%	9,760	3,253	-5%
12	Litherland	3	8,979	2,993	-8%	9,894	3,298	-4%
13	Manor	3	9,928	3,309	1%	10,916	3,639	6%
14	Meols	3	10,014	3,338	2%	10,721	3,574	4%
15	Molyneux	3	10,178	3,393	4%	10,824	3,608	5%


Ward name	Number of councillors	Electorate (2023)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %	Electorate (2029)	Number of electors per councillor	Variance from average %
16 Netherton & Orrell	3	8,990	2,997	-8%	9,345	3,115	-9%
17 Norwood	3	10,473	3,491	7%	10,883	3,628	6%
18 Park	3	10,619	3,540	8%	11,273	3,758	10%
19 Ravenmeols	3	9,659	3,220	-1%	10,172	3,391	-1%
20 St Oswald	3	9,297	3,099	-5%	9,521	3,174	-7%
21 Sudell	3	9,254	3,085	-6%	10,672	3,557	4%
22 Victoria	3	9,603	3,201	-2%	9,708	3,236	-6%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>215,581</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>226,389</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Averages</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,266</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>3,430</b>	<b>-</b>

Source: Electorate figures are based on information provided by Sefton Council.

Note: The 'variance from average' column shows by how far, in percentage terms, the number of electors per councillor in each electoral ward varies from the average for the borough. The minus symbol (-) denotes a lower than average number of electors. Figures have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

## Appendix B

### Outline map



A more detailed version of this map can be seen on the large map accompanying this report, or on our website: [www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/sefton](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/sefton)

## Appendix C

### Submissions received

All submissions received can also be viewed on our website at:

[www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/sefton](http://www.lgbce.org.uk/all-reviews/sefton)

#### *Political Groups*

- Sefton Conservative Group
- Sefton Labour Group
- Southport Liberal Democrats

#### *Parish and Town Councils*

- Formby Parish Council
- Little Altcar Parish Council
- Maghull Town Council
- Thornton Parish Council

#### *Local Residents*

- 22 local residents



## Appendix D

### Glossary and abbreviations

Council size	The number of councillors elected to serve on a council
Electoral Change Order (or Order)	A legal document which implements changes to the electoral arrangements of a local authority
Division	A specific area of a county, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever division they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the county council
Electoral inequality	Where there is a difference between the number of electors represented by a councillor and the average for the local authority
Electorate	People in the authority who are registered to vote in elections. We only take account of electors registered specifically for local elections during our reviews.
Number of electors per councillor	The total number of electors in a local authority divided by the number of councillors
Over-represented	Where there are fewer electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Parish	A specific and defined area of land within a single local authority enclosed within a parish boundary. There are over 10,000 parishes in England, which provide the first tier of representation to their local residents

Parish council	A body elected by electors in the parish which serves and represents the area defined by the parish boundaries. See also 'Town council'
Parish (or town) council electoral arrangements	The total number of councillors on any one parish or town council; the number, names and boundaries of parish wards; and the number of councillors for each ward
Parish ward	A particular area of a parish, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever parish ward they live for candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the parish council
Town council	A parish council which has been given ceremonial 'town' status. More information on achieving such status can be found at <a href="http://www.nalc.gov.uk">www.nalc.gov.uk</a>
Under-represented	Where there are more electors per councillor in a ward or division than the average
Variance (or electoral variance)	How far the number of electors per councillor in a ward or division varies in percentage terms from the average
Ward	A specific area of a district or borough, defined for electoral, administrative and representational purposes. Eligible electors can vote in whichever ward they are registered for the candidate or candidates they wish to represent them on the district or borough council

The  
Local Government  
Boundary Commission  
for England

The Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE) was set up by Parliament, independent of Government and political parties. It is directly accountable to Parliament through a committee chaired by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It is responsible for conducting boundary, electoral and structural reviews of local government.

Local Government Boundary Commission for  
England  
1st Floor, Windsor House  
50 Victoria Street, London  
SW1H 0TL

**Telephone:** 0330 500 1525

**Email:** [reviews@lgbce.org.uk](mailto:reviews@lgbce.org.uk)

**Online:** [www.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.lgbce.org.uk)

[www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk](http://www.consultation.lgbce.org.uk)

**Twitter:** @LGBCE