

Eleanor Gregory

From: Eleanor Gregory
Sent: 08 February 2010 14:59
To: Richard Buck
Subject: FW: Cheshire East Labour Party LGC Response to the Interim Report of the Boundary Committee
Attachments: Cheshire East Covering letter to Boundary Commissionh.doc; Response to draft proposals.doc

From: Ken Edwards [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 February 2010 12:39
To: Reviews@
Subject: Cheshire East Labour Party LGC Response to the Interim Report of the Boundary Committee

Dear Boundary Committee,
Please find attached the response to your Interim Report on the re warding of Cheshire East Borough Council plus a covering letter.

Please takes these representations into consideration before drafting your final report.

Thank You
Ken Edwards
Secretary
Cheshire East Labour Party Local Government Committee

new Labour for Britain

**CHESHIRE EAST
LABOUR LOCAL
GOVERNMENT
COMMITTEE**

Secretary	Ken Edwards	01625 571126 ken@molepolole.freeserve.co.uk 48 Hurst Lane, Bollington Cheshire, SK10 5LT
Chair	David Newton	01270 619331 dnewton374@btinternet.com 58 The Beeches, Nantwich, CW5 5YP
Treasurer	Dorothy Flude	01270 664121 6 Tynedale Avenue, Crewe Cheshire CW2 7NY Dorothy.Flude@cheshireeast.gov. uk

24th July 2009

James Ansell
Review Officer – Cheshire East
The Boundary Committee for England
Trevelyan House
Great Peter Street
London
SW1P 2HW

Dear James Ansell,

Re: Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee Submission regarding the re-warding of Cheshire East Unitary Borough Council area.

I am sending you a proposal for re-warding Cheshire East on the instructions of Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee representing the five Constituency Labour Parties covering the appropriate area. These are Macclesfield CLP, Crewe and Nantwich CLP and Congleton CLP which are themselves wholly within the Cheshire East Unitary authority Boundary. Tatton CLP which has the large majority of its area within the CLP boundary and Eddisbury which has only a very small part of the Constituency within its boundary.

The submission has taken into account numbers of electors, identifiable communities, the need for relatively deprived areas for clear representation and, where possible, appropriate numbers of councillors in relation to ward areas.

Yours sincerely,

Ken Edwards
Secretary
Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee.

Every day in every way Labour influences the agenda throughout Cheshire East

Printed and published by Ken Edwards 48 Hurst Lane Bollington Cheshire SK10 5LT

Response by Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee to draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee

1. Macclesfield

We generally support proposals for the rural parts of the pre-2009 Borough of Macclesfield and in general, with respect to Macclesfield Town, we strongly support the approach of creating a mix of 2 member wards, with single member wards where appropriate and believe that these arrangements are far more preferable than the 3 member wards proposed by Cheshire East Council, which we consider do not encourage the articulation of particular needs within those large and disparate areas.

However, we do have concerns with the Boundary Committee proposals for the West and South West of Macclesfield. Although this is an area where strong boundaries that do not divide community interests are generally more difficult to formulate, we still believe that there is a strong case for a separate single-member ward to represent the Weston estate. We believe that the community links evident within the Weston estate that are described in our original proposals make a powerful case for giving this area its own representation. The current Boundary Committee proposals attach the Weston to areas which are quite different demographically and will seriously weaken the ability of this needy area to get support for all the very specific measures required, particularly those relating to the large elderly population. For example, the transport and health needs of the Weston estate are quite different from those of the Ivy area.

We believe that the Boundary Committee proposal to include the area which it entitles Gawsworth Moss in an urban ward is a sensible one and that this should also form part of the proposed Macclesfield Ivy Ward.

2. Alsager

We would ask the Boundary Committee to reconsider its approach to the proposal, supported by Cheshire East council, to include at least that part of the village of Oakhanger (in the parish of Haslington) within the Alsager warding system. The community of interest of these residents in Close Lane, for example, whose postal address is in Alsager, and who are at some distance from other concentrations of housing, is self-evident from the map. The draft report argued that this proposal “would also necessitate the creation of impractical parish wards with too few electors to enable viable parish governance”. Yet a parish ward of 127 electors is regarded as far from impractical in many other areas and the incidence of the motorway, which was of course built many years after parish boundaries were originally settled is surely a highly significant feature which cannot be ignored. It would also help to improve the ratio of electors per councillor for the 3-member Alsager ward closer to the norm, whilst retaining an acceptably low deviation for the 2-member Haslington ward.

3. Crewe

Response by Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee to draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee

3.1. Crewe South and Shavington

In general, the Boundary Committee proposals have sought to separate parished areas from those parts of urban Crewe that are not parished. This is an approach that we welcome, especially since we support the creation of a Town Council for the unparished parts of Crewe.

Within the Boundary Committee proposals, however, there is one exception to this approach, which we believe should be rectified in the interests of consistency, as well as recognising the established local (i.e. parish) council arrangements that exist on all sides of the town.

It is our view that current Polling District 1GM2 (Shavington Parish – Gresty Brook ward) should be removed from Crewe South Ward and be included in the proposed Shavington Ward, along with the rest of the Shavington-cum-Gresty parish. It is forecast that in 2013 this area will include 550 electors. While it might be argued that this area does not itself include a direct road link with the rest of the parish, the same can be said of the “College Fields” estate lying within polling district 1FG2 (Christchurch Avenue, College Fields, Harrow Close, Magdalen Court, Sandhurst Avenue, Trinity Close). This latter estate lies within the current Wistaston Green parish ward of Wistaston parish, and has been included within the proposed two-member Wistaston Ward.

In fact the Gresty Brook parish ward and the “College Fields” estate both have well-used pedestrian access to the remainder of their respective parishes (across the Gresty Brook and Wistaston Brook respectively, both of which are sections of the same historic watercourse that marked the boundary of the erstwhile Nantwich Rural District). Consistency alone surely must require that these two parished areas be dealt with in the same manner.

In addition, the Shavington-cum-Gresty parish council is established as both a convenient and effective unit of local government. The parish council itself favours a single member unitary ward based upon the parish council boundaries, and was planning to respond to the Boundary Committee to that effect, following a decision taken in public at the meeting held on Wednesday 3rd December 2009. Local residents in the parish want clear lines of accountability to the parish council by the unitary council. At present no such clarity exists, especially as six unitary councillors from three different political parties can be involved in any local matter.

It makes sense to recognise the value of a single-member ward for the whole of Shavington-cum-Gresty parish, as is the case for Leighton parish, which the Boundary Committee has already proposed should be a single-member unitary ward.

Response by Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee to draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee

The effect of this change would be to increase the electorate of the proposed Shavington Ward to 3,800 in 2013 (+7.0%).

Taken in isolation, this would reduce the electorate of the proposed two-member Crewe South Ward to 6,562 in 2013 (-7.6%). But please note further changes are proposed for Crewe South in the next section.

3.2. Crewe South and Crewe West

We propose that the boundary between the Crewe West and Crewe South wards be re-aligned. It is suggested that the "Rosehill Road estate" area be transferred from Crewe South to Crewe West. This would involve the transfer of part of current Polling District 1BD2 (Brown Lees Close, Dappleheath Road, part of Dane Bank Avenue, Denston Close, Englesea Grove, Manor Avenue, Merebank Road, Rosehill Road and Thorley Grove) and part of current Polling District 1DB1 (odd numbers 263-349 Nantwich Road). It is forecast that in 2013 these areas will include approximately 600 electors.

This would imply the boundary between the two wards would run down the middle of Nantwich Road from the traffic lights at the junction with Salisbury Avenue as far as Manor Avenue. The Boundary Committee has already proposed this boundary in part, inasmuch as odd numbers 263-303 Nantwich Road are included within the proposed Crewe West Ward. This further alteration brings together, within Crewe West Ward, all those areas that effectively comprise the educational "campus" for the western side of urban Crewe. It also produces a cleaner boundary between the two wards around the Nantwich Road area, and recognises the different community identities that exist either side of the road in this neighbourhood.

To compensate for this change, it is also proposed that polling district 1DD1 be transferred from Crewe West Ward back into Crewe South Ward, where it is currently located, and with which it has a long-established affinity. This area of mainly Victorian and Edwardian terraced housing surrounds the Valley Brook in Alton Street and Crewe municipal swimming baths in Flag Lane, and has been part of the distinctive community of Crewe South Ward for over 100 years. This can be borne out by examination of the Ordnance Survey maps for this area that were published in 1910. In addition, the municipal facilities around the Valley Brook have long been a focal point for leisure use by the local community, since they were first provided by the local council back in the 1930s. The forecast electorate for this area in 2013 is 790.

The effect of the proposed changes outlined above plus the alteration outlined in section 1.1 would be as follows:-

Crewe West electorate in 2013 would be 7,508 (+5.7%)
Crewe South electorate in 2013 would be 6,752 (-4.9%)

**Response by Cheshire East Labour Local Government Committee
to draft recommendations of the Boundary Committee**

4. Nantwich

4.1. Wybunbury

Within the draft proposals the name of this village is consistently and wrongly spelt Wynbunbury. This error needs to be corrected.