

# Calderdale

## Personal Details:

**Name:** Mr Thomas Nolan  
**Email:** [REDACTED]  
**Postcode:** [REDACTED]  
**Organisation Name:** CMBC (District or county officer)

## Comment text:

**Related subject:** Calderdale Council

This submission is made on behalf of Calderdale Council Conservative Group.

Please find attached 3 documents. The Proposal and Appendix A and B.

Don't hesitate to contact Thomas Nolan (Political Assistant) for further details.  
Thomas.Nolan@calderdale.gov.uk

## Attached Documents:

- Local Government Boundary Proposal 2023.pdf
- Appendix A.xlsx
- Appendix B.pdf

---

# **Local Government Boundary Proposal**

**JULY 2023**

**Calderdale Council Conservative Group**

---

## **Introduction**

The Calderdale Conservative & Unionist Group is the largest Opposition Party on Calderdale Council with 15 elected representatives across the Borough. The current arrangement for Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council consists of 17 wards, and 51 councillors.

This Proposal by the Calderdale Conservative & Unionist Group is a response to the Local Government Boundary Commission that is in the process of carrying “out an initial public consultation on communities” (LGBC, 2023).

This short proposal will outline two evidence-based solutions centered on criteria set out by the Commission and moving forward these can act as a foundation for further input by residents, community groups, and other interest parties.

In the first part, the proposal outlines that the Conservative Group strongly disagrees with the “minded to” decision to increase the number of wards to 18 and councillors to 54. The Group notes that this decision is “minded to” which implies this not a foregone conclusion. It later was confirmed by Commission that any future recommendations to Parliament will be based on the proposals put forward and the arguments made by residents.

Therefore, the first part of this proposal explains why 17 wards and 51 councillors is most suitable for the Calderdale. Electoral equality; convenient and effective local government; and community identity and interests are achieved under the current system of 17 wards and 51 councillors. However, this proposal will not argue for the size of the Council based on the criteria of governance arrangements, the representational role of councillors and scrutiny functions. This was the advice of the office team at the Local Government Boundary Commission because this stage of the Review Process is notionally complete. Nonetheless, it will discuss the fundamental errors of the decision to increase to 54.

The second half of the proposal will outline the Group’s suggested boundaries and an additional Ward for the Commission that is based on 18 wards and 54 councillors. The justification for providing another potential solution to the Review Process is two-fold. The first is to provide the Commission and residents in Calderdale ample options which can be further built-up in later stages. And secondly, to ensure that Commission also has multiple options because it can be concluded the “minded to” decision of 18 wards and 54 Councillors was based on input by the Calderdale Labour Group because no other Groups including the Conservative Group provided a proposal at this stage.

---

The details of specific boundaries and wards are found in Appendix A and B. These are separate to this document, with Appendix A including an excel spreadsheet of wards and Appendix B a map of the boundaries.

## **Part 1 – 17 Wards and 51 Councillors**

The overall argument for maintaining the current system in Calderdale is based on the principle that the system works well for Calderdale which is evidenced by the successful running of local elections and the smooth transition of representatives in each Ward. The Conservative Group in Calderdale is the main Opposition Party in the Borough, and the Group fundamentally disagrees with Labour's Leadership and many of their actions to date. However, the overall electoral and governance in Calderdale works well for residents and councillors and any changes to the electoral make-up of the region will not resolve problems faced by the Council.

The principle "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" is the baseline of this proposal because government should focus on the issues that require attention. This principle is often attributed to Conservatism, but for Calderdale Council it is fully applicable. Therefore, the Commission should focus its efforts on further electoral equality because this can be improved, but local interests and especially convenient and effective local government are currently achieved through the system that is established and functional of 17 wards and 51 councillors.

## **Electoral Equality**

In terms of electoral equality, the justification for increasing the number of councillors based on the growth of population is understandable. The statistics provided by the Commission show an increase of approximately 9000 and on first consideration this would equate to an additional 3 councillors.

The Commission shows that this increase would equate on average to an additional 200 electors per councillor. Further scrutiny, however, shows that regionally Calderdale with the additional 200 electorate per councillor, Calderdale will remain in the middle of the table compared to other local authorities (ONS, 2022). For example, councillors successfully fulfill their duties in Wakefield, Kirklees and Bradford under electorate to councillor ratios of 4,148, 4553, and 4112 (ONS, 2022). Therefore, on examination to increase the number of councillors on this basis is inaccurate because there are no grounds to argue that there is electoral inequality compared to the regional figures. Councillors will not be overburdened by the additional electorate and so residents will continue to have good access to their councillors.

At the last Review, the Council size was reduced from 54 councillors to 51 because "ward sizes in Calderdale are well below those in neighboring Metropolitan authorities" (LGBC, 2003) and as this

---

remains the case today and will do with future growth, the Commission should continue with this precedent.

Electoral equality depends on more than regional comparison, and for Calderdale it is important that electoral numbers across the Wards are consistent. Under the system of 51 councillors this is achieved but work is required to lessen the variance across the Wards, especially in Luddendenfoot and Northowarm and Shelf. Whilst Appendix A does include an extra ward and is overall focused on 54 councillors, the Commission can study this for example on how the variances lessen because the proposals are based on local interests and knowledge.

In Appendix A, Brighouse, Rastrick and Ryburn provide good examples. Firstly, looking at Brighouse and its neighbour Hipperholme and Lightcliffe, the best solution and least impactful on residents would be to incorporate a section of the polling district St Chads (EE) because this regional area is split between both Wards with certain streets split in half. Secondly, for Rastrick, the residents living in the Elland district Upper Edge (CA) do consider themselves more aligned with Rastrick than Elland. And thirdly, for Sowerby whilst it does not have much variance, there is the argument to include sections of Sowerby, White Windows or Triangle from Ryburn ward based on local interests. This also leads to the issues of rural vs urban wards.

The landscape of Calderdale is problematic due its mixture of rural and urban areas, which for councillors in rural areas can mean difficulties in reaching all residents. Therefore, wards such as Ryburn and Luddendenfoot variances should be minimal, but effective local government and the constraints of rural Wards needs to be considered so councillors can successfully undertake their responsibilities. However, before effective local government is discussed further, it is important to reference the Local Plan and its potential impacts on electoral equality.

It is unclear whether the Local Plan is incorporated in the growth statistics because the Council plans to build up to 14,950 houses (Calderdale Council, 2023), which has the potential of increasing the electorate multiple times this figure, as the majority of these houses will be 2/3-bedroom properties. For instance, in Rastrick and Brighouse, respectfully 1071 houses and 1927 houses are to be built, with 60 – 80% proposed to be 2/3-bedroom properties (Calderdale Council, 2023). The argument could be made that this development will not be finished by 2029, but the changes made by the Commission need to be “future proof” and development will start from 2024.

However, whilst the Local Plan has been given approval by Council, resident’s groups are unhappy with it and are seeking legal action so certain aspects could be delayed or may not go ahead. Overall, the issues raised by the local plan, supports the argument to maintain the current system because electoral equality over the long term is difficult to achieve, and implementing an additional ward at this time may cause further difficulties down the road when boundaries must be redrawn again due to large changes due to the Local Plan.

---

## **Convenient and Effective Local Government**

The Local Plan also directly links to convenient and effective local government because implementing a large change now may have to be redone once the local plan is completed over the next decade. Therefore, this is not the time to make large and unnecessary changes to the Calderdale.

Shifting back to workload, this is an important consideration on effective local government. As already discussed, the additional 200 electorate on average per councillor will not overburden councillors, and our neighboring authorities successfully represent their residents with much higher ratios.

In addition, since the last Review Process in 2003 much has changed. The biggest changes are the rise of social media and the creation of the West Yorkshire Combined Authority (WYCA). Social media can be viewed in two ways – the first would see it as an extra burden with its 24-hour access, whilst the second would view it as making the lives easier for councillors as they can access residents and campaign easier. There is more evidence for the latter because there is difference between the social media of a Member of Parliament who is burdened with requirements to have a professional online presence, and this carefully entails tailor content. But as a local councillor, social media is not a requirement, it does help to have access in order to promote their work and increase accessibility for residents, and many political Groups work through one social media account to achieve this aim.

In relation to WYCA, this does increase the workload for councillors that volunteer for the roles, but in many cases, this only involves a handful of councillors, and they are often compensated for their time, so this should not be considered as an additional responsibility under councillors' work for Calderdale Council. Covid has also intervened and has made the role of a councillor easier since many meetings now take place online. Hence, the amount of time spent at the Town Hall is reduced dramatically.

## **Community Identity and Interests**

Community Identity and interest has already been referenced previously regarding the suggested changes to Brighouse, Hipperholme and Lightcliffe, Rastrick, Elland, Ryburn and Sowerby Bridge. Moving forward, these should act as foundations for further input by residents, community groups, and other interested groups.

The overarching context of British politics is an important variable because political engagement has fallen over several decades (UK Government, 2022) and this is paralleled with trust in politicians

---

(NatCen, 2022). Hence, to increase the number of elected representatives would only exasperate these issues because this move will increase the bureaucracy and cost of local politics.

We are aware that the commission is independent and in the previous electoral review in 2003, the commission was successful in hearing the views of different groups and residents. But it is impossible to make one group or set of residents better off without making other groups or residents worse off when in the process of changing the number of councillors.

## **Part 2 – 18 Wards & 54 Councillors**

The second half of the proposal outlines the Group's suggested boundaries and an additional ward for the Commission that is based on 18 wards and 54 councillors. As previously stated, the justification for providing another potential solution to the Review Process is two-fold. The first is to provide the Commission and residents in Calderdale ample options, which can be further built-up in later stages. And secondly, to ensure that the Commission has multiple options because it is evident the decision to increase the number of councillors to 54, was based on an imbalance of views at an earlier stage.

The details of specific boundaries and wards are found in Appendix A and B. These are separate to this document, with Appendix A including a excel spreadsheet of wards, and Appendix B, a map of the boundaries.

## **Conclusion**

The Conservative Group does not agree that Calderdale should create another ward at this time, for the reasons explained earlier. However, because of the "minded to" comment which already appears to have been decided, we have endeavored to constructively propose an additional ward on fairness and local knowledge.

---

## **References**

UK Parliament. (2019). Intimidation of political candidates: Review and recommendations. [Intimidation of political candidates: Review and recommendations \(parliament.uk\)](#).

National Centre for Social Research. (2021). British Social Attitudes 38: Democracy. [bsa38\\_democracy.pdf \(natcen.ac.uk\)](#).

Office for National Statistics. (2022). Electoral statistics for the UK. [Electoral statistics for the UK - Office for National Statistics \(ons.gov.uk\)](#).

Calderdale Council. (2023). Cabinet Agenda. [\(Public Pack\) Agenda Document for Cabinet, 07/08/2023 15:00 \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#).

Calderdale Council. (2023). Cabinet Agenda. [calderdale.moderngov.co.uk/documents/g3021/Public reports pack 02nd-Mar-2023 18.00 Cabinet.pdf?T=10](#).

Local Government Boundary Commission. (2003). Final recommendations on the future electoral arrangements for Calderdale. [Political groups on the Council \(lgbce.org.uk\)](#)

Local Government Boundary Commission. (2023). Calderdale. [Calderdale | LGBCE](#)



Polling district/Ward	Description of area	Split?	Split ratio	Electorate 2022	Electorate 2029	Electorate 2029 (after proposed changes)	Existing ward
Brighouse							
AA	WHINNEY HILL			745	751	751	Brighouse
AB	BRIGHOUSE EAST			1872	1885	1885	Brighouse
AC	SLEAD SYKE			1325	1659	1659	Brighouse
AD	CLIFTON			1513	1649	1649	Brighouse
AE	BRIGHOUSE CENTRAL	Split w/Town South (new)	1041:500	1442	1541	1041	Brighouse
AF	WARING GREEN			1377	1355	1355	Brighouse
EE	ST CHAD'S	Split w/Hipperholme	400:948	1337	1348	400	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
						8740	
Calder							
BA	FAIRFIELD			1258	1311	1311	Calder
BB	BIRCHCLIFFE	Split w/Luddendenfoot	700:401	1125	1101	700	Calder
BC	WEST END			1001	960	960	Calder
BD	NURSERY NOOK			273	268	268	Calder
BE	WADSWORTH			948	941	941	Calder
BF	EASTWOOD			320	320	320	Calder
BG	BLACKSHAW			424	435	435	Calder
BH	ERRINGDEN			150	150	150	Calder
BJ	COLDEN			241	260	260	Calder
BK	HEPTONSTALL			902	869	869	Calder
BL	STOODLEY			1887	1964	1964	Calder
BM	KILNHURST			710	769	769	Calder
						8947	
Elland							
CA	UPPER EDGE	Split w/Rastrick	902:451	930	1353	902	Elland
CB	WESTGATE	Split w/Town South (new)	1282:600	1574	1882	1282	Elland
CC	ELLAND CENTRAL			1932	2172	2172	Elland
CD	SAVILE ROAD			1225	1181	1181	Elland
CE	OLD EARTH			1646	2075	2075	Elland
CF	AINLEY TOP			388	362	362	Elland
CG	BROOKSBANK			1107	1104	1104	Elland
						9078	
Greetland & Stainland							
DA	GREETLAND			1852	1854	1854	Greetland & Stainland
DB	WEST VALE			1619	1764	1764	Greetland & Stainland
DC	HOLYWELL GREEN			1570	1505	1505	Greetland & Stainland
DD	STAINLAND			1029	1034	1034	Greetland & Stainland
DE	SOWOOD			720	719	719	Greetland & Stainland
DF	NORLAND			537	545	545	Greetland & Stainland
DG	SUNNYBANK			1179	1881	1881	Greetland & Stainland
						9302	
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe							
EA	LEEDS ROAD			1848	1846	1846	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
EB	HIPPERHOLME	Split w/Town South (new)	1811:500	1831	2311	1811	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
EC	NORWOOD GREEN			426	426	426	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
ED	LIGHTCLIFFE			1620	1750	1750	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
EE	ST CHAD'S	Split w/Brighouse	948:400	1337	1348	948	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
EF	BAILIFF BRIDGE			2038	2105	2105	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
						8886	
Ilkington & Mixenden							
FA	MIXENDEN			1349	1579	1579	Ilkington & Mixenden
FB	ASH TREE			959	1111	1111	Ilkington & Mixenden
FC	BRADSHAW			2639	2525	2525	Ilkington & Mixenden
FD	WHITEHILL			2019	2408	2408	Ilkington & Mixenden
FE	ABBAY PARK			1269	1414	1414	Ilkington & Mixenden
FF	HOLMFIELD	Move to Ovenden		968	925	0	Ilkington & Mixenden
						9037	

Luddendenfoot							
GA	WAINSTALLS			417	391	391	Luddendenfoot
GB	LUDDENDEN			1021	1004	1004	Luddendenfoot
GC	LUDDENDENFOOT			1164	1129	1129	Luddendenfoot
GD	WARLEY WOOD			764	758	758	Luddendenfoot
GE	MIDGLEY			360	371	371	Luddendenfoot
GF	BOULDERCLOUGH			338	346	346	Luddendenfoot
GG	SCOUT ROAD			941	949	949	Luddendenfoot
GH	CRAGG VALE			506	507	507	Luddendenfoot
GJ	CALDENE			1168	1187	1187	Luddendenfoot
GK	WHITE LEE			1337	1344	1344	Luddendenfoot
BB	BIRCHCLIFFE	Split w/Luddendenfoot	700:401	1125	1101	401	Calder
						<b>8387</b>	

Northowarm & Shelf							
HA	NORTHOWRAM GREEN			1796	2117	2117	Northowram & Shelf
HB	BACK CLOUGH			1901	1931	1931	Northowram & Shelf
HC	CLAREMOUNT	Move to Town North (new)		1497	1525	0	Northowram & Shelf
HD	SHELF			1966	2453	2453	Northowram & Shelf
HE	WITCHFIELD HILL			1953	2186	2186	Northowram & Shelf
						<b>8687</b>	

Ovenden							
JA	OVENDEN			1369	1421	1421	Ovenden
JB	LEE MOUNT			2075	2196	2196	Ovenden
JC	DEANFIELD			2304	2620	2620	Ovenden
JD	MOORSIDE			1252	1626	1626	Ovenden
JE	THE HEBBLE	Move to Town North(new)		1456	1476	0	Ovenden
FF	HOLMFIELD	Move from Illingworth		968	925	925	Illingworth & Mixenden
						<b>8788</b>	

Park							
KA	PARKINSON LANE			1562	1667	1667	Park
KB	PEOPLE'S PARK	Split w/Town North (new)	341:1000	1244	1341	341	Park
KC	KING CROSS			1084	1114	1114	Park
KD	WARLEY ROAD			2189	2235	2235	Park
KE	ST JOHN'S			969	1035	1035	Park
KF	BEECH HILL	Move to Town North (new)		672	745	0	Park
KG	QUEENS			1794	1771	1771	Park
SA	CLAY PITS	Split w/Warley	1000:572	1403	1572	572	Warley
						<b>8735</b>	

<b>Rastrick</b>							
LA	CARR GREEN			1398	1399	1399	Rastrick
LB	WOODHOUSE			1700	2062	2062	Rastrick
LC	RASTRICK			1619	1651	1651	Rastrick
LD	LONGROYDE			1906	1956	1956	Rastrick
LE	FIELD LANE			1663	1721	1721	Rastrick
CA	UPPER EDGE	Split w/Elland	451: 902	930	1353	451	Elland
						<b>9240</b>	

Ryburn							
MA	MILL BANK			378	392	392	Ryburn
MB	SOWERBY			1320	1455	1455	Ryburn
MC	WHITE WINDOWS	Split w/Sowerby Bridge	500:439	954	939	500	Ryburn
MD	TRIANGLE	Split w/Sowerby Bridge	547:100	539	647	547	Ryburn
ME	BARKISLAND			1311	1308	1308	Ryburn
MF	RIPPONDEN			1701	1742	1742	Ryburn
MG	RISHWORTH			864	851	851	Ryburn
MH	STONES			559	548	548	Ryburn
MJ	SOYLAND			1039	1059	1059	Ryburn
MK	LIGHTHAZELS			255	261	261	Ryburn
						8663	

## Skircoat

NA	MANOR HEATH	Split w/Town South (new)	1500:247	1741	1747	1500	Skircoat
NB	STAFFORD	Split w/Town South (new)	948:400	1305	1348	948	Skircoat
NC	SKIRCOAT GREEN			2096	2152	2152	Skircoat
ND	COPLEY			1059	1073	1073	Skircoat
NF	SAVILE PARK			1678	1765	1765	Skircoat
NE	WELL HEAD	Split w/Town North (new)	700:1068	1763	1768	700	Skircoat
PF	SPRING EDGE	Split w/Sowerby Bridge	500:293	767	793	500	Sowerby Bridge

8638

Sowerby Bridge							
PA	WILLOWFIELD			2235	2243	2243	Sowerby Bridge
PB	PYE NEST			1969	2209	2209	Sowerby Bridge
PC	SOWERBY BRIDGE NORTH			1957	1976	1976	Sowerby Bridge
PD	SOWERBY BRIDGE CENTRAL			947	948	948	Sowerby Bridge
PE	QUARRY HILL			932	1055	1055	Sowerby Bridge
MD	TRIANGLE	Split w/Sowerby Bridge	100:547	539	647	100	Ryburn
MC	WHITE WINDOWS	Split w/Sowerby Bridge	439:500	954	939	439	Ryburn
PF	SPRING EDGE	Split w/Skircoat	293:500	767	793	293	Sowerby Bridge

9263

Todmorden							
QA	TODMORDEN CENTRAL NO 1			682	680	680	Todmorden
QB	TODMORDEN CENTRAL NO 2			1556	1522	1522	Todmorden
QC	CORNHOLME			965	965	965	Todmorden
QD	PORTSMOUTH			703	701	701	Todmorden
QE	LANGFIELD			1220	1214	1214	Todmorden
QF	STANSFIELD			1236	1251	1251	Todmorden
QG	CENTRE VALE			619	662	662	Todmorden
QH	WALSDEN ST PETER'S			1077	1217	1217	Todmorden
QJ	WALSDEN SOUTH			943	916	916	Todmorden

9128

Town South (new)							
RB	TOWN CENTRAL			866	1065	1065	Town
RD	SOUTHOWRAM			2377	2410	2410	Town
RE	SIDDAL			1615	1765	1765	Town
RF	WHITEGATE			1101	1269	1269	Town
CB	WESTGATE	Split w/Elland	600:1282	1574	1882	600	Elland
AE	BRIGHOUSE CENTRAL	Split w/Brighouse	500:1041	1442	1541	500	Brighouse
EB	HIPPERHOLME	Split w/Hipperholme	500: 1811	1831	2311	500	Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
NA	MANOR HEATH	Split w/Town South (new)	1500:247	1741	1747	247	Skircoat
NB	STAFFORD	Split w/Skircoat	400:948	1305	1348	400	Skircoat

8756

Warley							
SA	CLAY PITS	Split/Park	1000:572	1403	1572	1000	Warley
SB	LING BOB			1492	1650	1650	Warley
SC	HIGHROAD WELL			1586	1558	1558	Warley
SD	WARLEY TOWN			516	570	570	Warley
SE	PELLON			932	911	911	Warley
SF	MOUNT TABOR			899	833	833	Warley
SG	NORTON TOWER			1679	1590	1590	Warley
SH	OVENDEN WOOD			611	703	703	Warley

8815

Town North (new)							
RA	TOWN NORTHERN	Move from Town		531	556	556	Town
RC	BOOTH TOWN	Move from Town		2554	2556	2556	Town
NE	WELL HEAD	splrit w/Skircoat	1068:700	1763	1768	1068	Skircoat
KB	PEOPLE'S PARK	splrit w/Park	1000:341	1244	1341	1000	Park
KF	BEECH HILL	Move from Park		672	745	745	Park
JE	THE HEBBLE	Move to Town North (new)		1456	1476	1476	Ovenden
HC	CLAREMOUNT	Move from Northowarm & Shelf		1497	1525	1525	Northowarm & Shelf

8926

New ward
----------

Brighouse
Brighouse
Brighouse
Brighouse
Brighouse
Brighouse
Brighouse

Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder
Calder

Elland
Elland
Elland
Elland
Elland
Elland
Elland
Elland

Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland
Greetland & Stainland

Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe

Illingworth & Mixenden
Illingworth & Mixenden
Illingworth & Mixenden
Illingworth & Mixenden
Illingworth & Mixenden
Ovenden

[illegible]

rural area so small pop

Northowram & Shelf
Northowram & Shelf
Northowram & Shelf
Northowram & Shelf
Northowram & Shelf

Ovenden
Ovenden
Ovenden
Ovenden
Central
Ovenden

Park
Park
Park
Park
Park
Central
Park
Warley

Rastrick
Rastrick
Rastrick
Rastrick
Rastrick
Rastrick

[illegible]

Bigger area so small pop than sowerby bridge

Skircoat	Near fire station
Skircoat	
Skircoat	
Skircoat	
Skircoat	
Skircoat	
Skircoat	

Sowerby Bridge	large pop as small area
Sowerby Bridge	
Sowerby Bridge	
Sowerby Bridge	
Sowerby Bridge	
Sowerby Bridge	
Sowerby Bridge	Near fire station
Sowerby Bridge	

Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden
Todmorden

Town
Town
Town
Town
Town
Town
Town
Town
Town

Warley
Warley
Warley
Warley
Warley
Warley
Warley
Warley

Central
Central
Central
Central
Central
Central

Name of Ward	Electorate 2022	Electorate 2029	Electorate 2029 (Proposed)
Brighouse	8,274	8,840	8740
Calder	9,239	9,348	8947
Elland	8,802	10,129	9078
Greetland & Stainland	8,506	9,302	9302
Hipperholme & Lightcliffe	9,100	9,786	8886
Illilngworth & Mixenden	9,203	9,962	9037
Luddendenfoot	8,016	7,986	8387
Northowram & Shelf	9,113	10,212	8687
Ovenden	8,456	9,339	8788
Park	9,514	9,908	8735
Rastrick	8,286	8,789	9240
Ryburn	8,920	9,202	8662
Skircoat	9,642	9,853	8638
Sowerby Bridge	8,807	9,224	9263
Todmorden	9,001	9,128	9128
Town	9,044	9,621	N/A
Warley	9,118	9,387	8815
Town South (New)	N/A	N/A	8756
Town North (New)	N/A	N/A	8926
	151,041	160,015	160015







